DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 044 PS 008 794

TITLE Child and Family Services Act, 1975. Joint Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, and the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress, First Session. Part 4.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.; Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PUB DATE 13 Mar 75

NOTE 166p.; Pages 725 and 743-747 are copyrighted and therefore not available. They are not included in the pagination; Not available in hard copy due to print size of original; For related documents, see PS 008 790-799

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Child Care; Child Care Centers; Child Welfare; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Legislation; Family Day Care; *Family Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Health Services; Infants; Medical Services; Migrant Welfare Services; Minority Groups; Nutrition; Parents; Preschool Children; Social Services; Standards; State Federal Aid

IDENTIFIERS *Child and Family Services Act; Legislative Hearings

ABSTRACT

This document records proceedings of the joint hearings on the Child and Family Services Act, 1975 (bills S.626 and H.R.2966). Included are witnesses' testimony of March 13, 1975, statements presented, and additional information (including related publications and communications). (SB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1975

ED127044

JOINT HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND MIGRATORY LABOR

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE UNITED STATES SENATE

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 626 and H.R. 2966

TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

PART 4

MARCH 13, 1975

Printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1976

57-649 O

PS 008794

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

DONALD ELISBURG, *General Counsel*
MARJORIE M. WHITTAKER, *Chief Clerk*
JAY B. CUTLER, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III, *Professional Staff Member*
LARRY GREENBERG, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND MIGRATORY LABOR

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
ALAN CRANSTON, California
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

RICHARD E. JOHNSON, *Counsel*
LARRY GREENBERG, *Minority Counsel*

NOTE: Copyrighted materials included in the original copy of this document are not available for ERIC reproduction at this time. The following articles have been deleted from this document:

p. 725 "Resolutions Passed by Assembly of Delegates, June 28, 1973." Journal of Home Economics; September 1973, p. 46.

p. 743-747 "Reaching Parents Through Involvement." Ronald J. Schmerber. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling; December 1974, p. 138-142.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico
MICHAEL BLOUIN, Iowa
ROBERT CORNELL, Wisconsin
TED RISENHOOVER, Oklahoma
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
RONALD MOTTL, Ohio
TIM HALL, Illinois

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
VIRGINIA SMITH, Nebraska

DONALD M. BAKER, *Chief Clerk and Associate Counsel*
ROBERT C. ANDRINGA, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
ROBERT CORNELL, Wisconsin
EDWARD BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
TIM HALL, Illinois
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Ex Officio*

ALPHONZO BELL, California
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota, *Ex Officio*

JACK G. DUNCAN, *Counsel*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1975

Coughlin, Hon. Lawrence, a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, accompanied by George Schott, former staff member ---------- Page 594

Reese, Msgr. Thomas J., secretary of the department of social concerns and executive director of Catholic Social Services of the Diocese of Wilmington, Del., representing the National Conference of Catholic Charities, accompanied by Dr. John W. Baker, associate director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; Ruth Gilbert, secretary for Community Action, secretariat of Christian Social Relations, Women's Division of the Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church; and William C. Tremitiere, manager of children's programs, Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates, a panel ---------- 673

Jolley, Mary Allen, director of public affairs, American Home Economics Association, accompanied by Ms. Marilyn Marcosson, executive director, American Parents Committee; Mrs. Lillie E. Herndon, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, accompanied by Mrs. Ann Kahn, chairman, National Congress of Parents and Teachers Legislative Services Committee; Ms. Dana Friedman, information specialist, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.; and Dr. Janet Heddesheimer, Government Relations Committee, American Personnel & Guidance Association, a panel ---------- 709

STATEMENTS

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, John W. Baker, associate director, prepared statement ---------- 678

Coughlin, Hon. Lawrence, a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, accompanied by George Schott, former staff member ---------- 594

Prepared statement ---------- 596

Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Theodore Taylor, executive director, prepared statement ---------- 734

Jolley, Mary Allen, director of public affairs, American Home Economics Association, accompanied by Ms. Marilyn Marcosson, executive director, American Parents Committee; Mrs. Lillie E. Herndon, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, accompanied by Mrs. Ann Kahn, chairman, National Congress of Parents and Teachers Legislative Services Committee; Ms. Dana Friedman, information specialist, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.; and Dr. Janet Heddesheimer, Government Relations Committee, American Personnel and Guidance Association, a panel ---------- 709

Prepared statement ---------- 716

Reese, Msgr. Thomas J., secretary of the department of social concerns and executive director of Catholic Social Services of the Diocese of Wilmington, Del., representing the National Conference of Catholic Charities, accompanied by Dr. John W. Baker, associate director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; Ruth Gilbert, secretary for Community Action, Secretariat of Christian Social Relations, Women's Division of the Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church; and William C. Tremitiere, manager of children's programs, Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates, a panel ---------- 673

Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates, William C. Tremitiere, manager of childrens' programs, prepared statement ---------- 690

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles publications, et cetera:

	Page
American Home Economics Association, resolution of, passed by assembly of delegates, June 28, 1973	725
"Reaching Parents Through Involvement," by Ronald J. Schmerber, from Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, December 1974	743
"Three Approaches To Reducing the Cost of Federally Funded Day Care Programs", by Congressman Lawrence Coughlin, July 9, 1974	601

Communications to:

Duncan, Jack, counsel, Subcommittee on Select Education, from Lillie E. Herndon, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago, Ill., May 15, 1975	755

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1975

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1975

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY,
AND MIGRATORY LABOR OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE;
AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to recess, at 9:38 a.m., in room 4232, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Richard S. Schweiker presiding pro tempore.

Present: Senators Schweiker and Stafford; Representatives Chisholm, Hall, and Pressler.

Senator SCHWEIKER (presiding pro tempore). The Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Subcommittee on Select Education, and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor will please come to order.

Today we begin the fourth day of joint hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Subcommittee on Select Education on S. 626 and H.R. 2966, Child and Family Services Act.

I am pleased to be serving as acting chairman today, along with Congresswoman Chisholm, who is acting chairman today for the House subcommittee.

Senator Mondale and Congressman Brademas are both unable to be here because of conflicting hearings in executive sessions. Senator Mondale, for example, is in a Finance Committee markup on the tax relief bill and oil depletion allowance bill.

Both have asked me to tell the witnesses how much they regret being unable to be here.

Let me say, we do not really control our own schedules. Other people control them for us. So I am sure their intentions and sincerity are without question.

We have a distinguished group of witnesses today, and I believe we should begin hearing them now.

Permit me to remind the witnesses of the so-called 5-minute rule we are trying to operate under, asking each witness to summarize his or her main points in 5 minutes so we can have time for discussion. Each witness' full statement will appear in the record in its entirety.

I would like to call on our cochairman, Congresswoman Chisholm, who has some opening remarks.

Mrs. Chisholm. Thank you very much.

I deem it a matter of great importance that we move as expeditiously as possible in these hearings on child care legislation, because of the economic factors across the Nation where many more women are going into the labor force to help supplement family income and keep the family unit together. In many instances many of these women are single parent heads of a household. We feel it is important that we get testimony from all the different organizations that have a keen interest in the welfare and health of the children in this Nation. The continuation of these hearings are very important because it will help the legislators in the Senate and the House of Representatives to mark up a bill that is meaningful and relevant to the situation we face in our Nation today.

At this moment, we are going to ask Senator Schweiker to introduce our first witness, Hon. Lawrence Coughlin, Representative from Pennsylvania.

Senator Schweiker. Thank you very much.

I see Senator Stafford has come in, who is ranking Republican on this subcommittee.

I am very pleased to call as our first witness Hon. Larry Coughlin, Congressman from Pennsylvania.

I am particularly pleased, being a member of one of the subcommittees, that Congressman Coughlin is my Congressman, and I served as his predecessor.

Larry, we are glad to have you with us. I know you have done some special work in this area.

STATEMENT OF HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, ACCOMPANIED BY GEORGE SCHOTT, FORMER STAFF MEMBER

Mr. Coughlin. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

It is my great pleasure and I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this panel.

With me is George Schott, who was formerly on my staff, and conducted a 5-month study of the application of federally funded day care programs in my congressional district.

I will summarize and submit for the record my formal testimony.

I think Mr. Schott's study is significant because it has been an attempt on our part to evaluate the application of Federal funds at the grassroots level and to see how the programs that are funded in Congress with taxpayers' money work and how the funds are applied.

George, during the course of that 5 months, analyzed and visited different day care programs in Montgomery County, Pa., which I represent. The most striking finding of the study was that a privately funded day care program can provide services at half the cost of a program which is federally financed.

For 1974, the yearly cost per child at the privately funded Grace Mennonite Church Child Day Care Center in Lansdale, Pa., is $1,425. The yearly cost per child for 1974 at the federally funded Crestmont Day Care Center in Willow Grove, Pa., is $2,860.

How are privately funded programs able to effect such substantial cost savings?

My study concluded that the disparity can be attributed to three primary factors.

First: Accounting for 43 percent of the cost savings is the fact that the private program studied is church-related, and church members are willing to assume important personnel responsibilities, such as making up the payroll, budget planning, and staff hiring.

The church also provides a rent-free facility and absorbs certain necessary program expenses such as insurance.

Second: Cost savings of 25 percent is due to the fact that private programs are not subject to Federal and certain State regulation. In particular, child-adult staffing ratio requirements do not apply to private programs and they can, therefore, operate with smaller staffs.

Third: Cost savings of 19 percent can be traced to the fact that the private program serves a basically middle income clientele requiring fewer services than the federally funded day care center which serves families of lower income.

The remaining cost savings are the result of factors too miscellaneous to categorize.

On the basis of this two-center comparison, I would make the following recommendations with respect to future Federal support for day care.

I would like to submit, if I might, for the record the entire study and ask that it be included.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Without objection, we will include that in the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mr. COUGHLIN. First: Federally funded day care programs should be encouraged to obtain greater support and assistance through cooperation with outside nonprofit organizations.

Second: Costly transportation services are, in some cases, unnecessary and could be curtailed or discontinued at some centers with no decline in attendance or program quality.

Third: Training consultant costs could be lowered at all centers by replacing individual center training sessions with group conferences operated on an areawide basis and by utilizing existing free workshops to a much greater extent.

Fourth: Since I found that the yearly cost per child declines approximately $126 when a center serving 25 children is expanded to 50 children, total program costs could be reduced if centers were to be consolidated to serve a larger enrollment.

These proposals would require no costly or time-consuming revision of current practices or organization. They are simple economies which could be achieved with little delay and I strongly urge the Congress to adopt them as specific policy objectives to be followed by local day care administrators who receive Federal funds.

In addition to these measures which could be implemented administratively, I believe Congress should set a Federal day care center rent ceiling to prevent landlords from charging excessive rents for their facilities. One federally funded center I looked at paid a whopping $1,000 a month in rent.

A substantial savings could be achieved if this practice were to be controlled by law with provision for special exemptions where a higher fee is determined to be reasonable and no alternative exists.

Lastly, I recommend strongly that Federal, as well as State, regulations governing day care services is reevaluated by the appropriate

agencies and legislative bodies to determine if standards are presently too strict and if they should be relaxed in some respects. This review seems all the more imperative in light of the fact that fully 80 percent of the cost of the federally funded Crestmont day care program I examined is mandated by either Federal or State regulations.

Taken together, the estimated total savings resulting from these recommendations amounts to $22,960. This figure represents 2 percent of the $1 million day care budget for Montgomery County in fiscal year 1974, and would be enough to provide day care to seven more children in the county for a year.

Projected nationwide, implementation of these cost-saving measures could save more than $10 million annually—a substantial sum of money—which could be used to finance an additional 3,500 day care slots each year.

The need for adequate day care programs is clear—for the child, for his family, and for the community in which they live.

Congress must work to insure the best possible day care services for the maximum number of children who need them within the resources available to us.

I believe the recommendations I have outlined today can contribute significantly to meeting this objective, and I hope your subcommittees will give them serious consideration during your deliberations on new day care and child development legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With that I will conclude my testimony.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Congressman. A very interesting comparison of costs between $1,400 from Grace Mennonite Church and $2,860.

You say later in your statement that 80 percent of the cost of the federally funded program was set by the State or Federal regulations.

Mr. COUGHLIN. That is essentially correct.

Senator SCHWEIKER. That is not 80 percent of the difference, it would be probably proportionately part of the difference?

Mr. COUGHLIN. That is correct.

Senator SCHWEIKER. In looking at other day care centers in Montgomery County, were there any others with similar discrepancies? I do not know how many you had a chance to look at and how many were available for that purpose, but how were the discrepancies in cost with other centers?

Mr. COUGHLIN. We did an in-depth comparison of two centers which were selected as representative of a federally funded day care center and privately funded day care center. We did some more routine examinations of other day care centers, but these two seemed typical in each case.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Are you saying that the Grace Mennonite Church Day Care Center is rather typical in terms of cost figures?

Mr. COUGHLIN. For privately funded day care centers. They have, as I mentioned in my testimony, two advantages in particular.

First of all, use of personnel that are already at the institution, in this case, the church, reduce some of the costs that would normally be added expenses at independent day care centers, such as federally funded centers.

And, in addition, they have a larger teacher-child or supervisor ratio.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you.

Cochairman Chisholm.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Representative Coughlin, I would like to ask you what provision has been made in these church-based privately funded child care centers for program standards, curriculum standards, and educational standards?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Of course they are not subject to the same regulations that the federally funded centers are because they are not federally funded. So that in terms of standards imposed by regulation, they do not have the standards that federally funded centers do.

Upon observation, however, the private center did appear to provide services that were roughly equivalent to the federally funded centers.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. How many early childhood education professionals or specialists were involved in the planning and the carrying out of the program?

Mr. COUGHLIN. In privately funded centers?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Yes.

Mr. COUGHLIN. There were not what you would call professionals that could be classified as such in carrying out the program in privately funded centers. But the programs were still basically similar.

There were educational services being provided. There were medical services being provided in spite of the fact that there was perhaps not the same level of professionalism strictly speaking.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. The reason for my asking these questions is that you know we have been fighting to keep some kind of interagency day care standards for children in our country. We know the necessity for having day care centers, but we are also very, very cognizant of the fact that the intellectual, physical, psychological, and emotional standards are very important because these are the early years in children's lives.

We have visited numbers of centers throughout this Nation where there has been some question as to whether or not some of the centers which were not getting Federal funds or who are raising their own funds are living up to basic standards that should be applicable to all children in the Nation.

This is the reason for my question, because we are very, very aware of the fact that day care center programs are going to be spreading all over this country. It is something we cannot prevent. It is the wave of the future.

We want to be sure that whether privately or publicly operated, that standards for young children are there. This is the reason why I am asking you about professionals and persons involved in planning the program.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I understand that.

Let me be very clear that the purpose of our testimony and the purpose of the study was not to say that we do not need to have regulations and standards in federally funded centers.

What we were trying to do was see what we could learn from the privately funded centers that might be applied to federally funded centers in terms of reducing costs and providing day care services for more young children.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you. No other questions.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Senator Stafford?

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I simply want to say I am very happy to see the very able Congressman from Pennsylvania here as a witness in front of this committee.

I knew him and was familiar with his distinguished work when we were colleagues in the House.

I am glad to see him over here. His testimony this morning will be very helpful to the deliberations of the subcommittee.

Thank you.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Thank you very much, Senator Stafford.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Coughlin and the study referred to previously follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

Good morning. I appreciate this opportunity to testify before this panel on the vitally important subject of day care. There is a tremendous need for quality day care services in the United States which is not being satisfied by existing programs. The Federal Government, looked to as the major source of funding, will most likely not be able to provide enough money to meet the demand for day care, and it is therefore realistic to ask if there are ways to reduce the cost of federally funded day care programs—without sacrificing quality—in order to allow Federal funds to serve a growing number of children.

In order to answer this question, I undertook last year a 5-month study of the structure and budgets of federally funded and nonfederally funded day care programs in my district which is in Montgomery County, Pa. This study is rather extensive and I shall submit it in its entirety for consideration and ask that it will be included as part of this hearing record as an addendum to my remarks. At this time, I would like to take a few minutes to review the major findings and recommendations contained in the study which I believe are extremely relevant to your consideration of the Federal Government's responsibility in the day care field.

The most striking finding of my study was that a privately funded day care program can provide services at half the cost of a program which is federally financed. For 1974 the yearly cost-per-child at the privately funded Grace Mennonite Church Child Day Care Center in Lansdale, Pa., is $1,435. The yearly cost-per-child for 1974 at the federally funded Crestmont Day Care Center in Willow Grove, Pa., is $2,860.

How are privately funded programs able to effect such substantial cost savings? My study concluded that the disparity can be attributed to three primary factors:

First: Accounting for 43 percent of the cost savings is the fact that the private program studied is church-related and church members are willing to assume important personnel responsibilities such as making up the payroll, budget planning, and staff hiring. The church also provides a rent-free facility and absorbs certain necessary program expenses such as insurance.

Secondly: Twenty-five percent of the cost savings is due to the fact that private programs are not subject to Federal and certain State

regulations. In particular, child-adult staffing ratio requirements do not apply to private programs and they can therefore operate with smaller staffs.

Third: Nineteen percent of the cost savings can be traced to the fact that the private program serves a basically middle-income clientele requiring fewer services than the federally funded day care center which serves families of lower income. The remaining cost savings are the result of factors too miscellaneous to categorize.

On the basis of this two-center comparison, I would make the following recommendations with respect to future Federal support for day care. First, federally funded day care programs should be encouraged to obtain greater support and assistance through cooperation with outside, nonprofit organizations. Second, costly transportation services are in some cases unnecessary and could be curtailed or discontinued at some centers with no decline in attendance or program quality. Third, training consultant costs could be lowered at all centers by replacing individual center training sessions with group conferences operated on an area-wide basis and by utilizing existing free workshops to a much greater extent. Fourth, since I found that the yearly cost per-child declines approximately $126 when a center serving 25 children is expanded to 50 children, total program costs could be reduced if centers were to be consolidated to serve a larger enrollment.

These proposals would require no costly or time-consuming revision of current practices or organization. They are simple economies which could be achieved with little delay and I strongly urge the Congress to adopt them as specific policy objectives to be followed by local day care administrators who receive Federal funds.

In addition to these measures which could be implemented administratively, I believe Congress should set a Federal day care center rent ceiling to prevent landlords from charging excessive rents for their facilities. One federally-funded center I looked at paid a whopping $1,000 a month in rent. A substantial savings could be achieved if this practice were to be controlled by law with provision for special exemptions where a higher fee is determined to be reasonable and no alternative exists.

Last, I recommend strongly that Federal as well as State regulations governing day care services be reevaluated by the appropriate agencies and legislative bodies to determine if standards are presently too strict and if they should be relaxed in some respects. This review seems all the more imperative in light of the fact that fully 80 percent of the cost of the federally funded Crestmont day care program I examined is mandated by either Federal or State regulations.

Taken together the estimated total savings resulting from these recommendations amounts to $22,960. This figure represents 2 percent of the $1 million day care budget for Montgomery County in fiscal year 1974 and would be enough to provide day care to seven more children in the county for a year. Projected nationwide, implementation of these cost-saving measures could save more than $10 million annually—a substantial sum of money—which could be used to finance an additional 3,500 day care slots each year.

The need for adequate day care programs is clear—for the child, for his family, and for the community in which they live. Congress must work to insure the best possible day care services for the maximum number of children who need them within the resources available to us. I believe the recommendations I have outlined today can contribute significantly to meeting this objective and I hope your subcommittees will give them serious consideration during your deliberations on new day care and child development legislation.

Thank you. I would be glad to answer any questions you might have.

[The study referred to by Mr. Coughlin follows:]

LAWRENCE COUGHLIN
11TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE ON
APPROPRIATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

WASHINGTON OFFICE
336 CANNON BUILDING
(202) 225-4111

DISTRICT OFFICE
607 SWEDE STREET
NORRISTOWN, PA. 19401
(215) 277-4040
LV 7-4060

THREE APPROACHES TO REDUCING THE COST OF FEDERALLY-FUNDED DAY CARE PROGRAMS

July 9, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Introduction	1
II	The Montgomery County, Pennsylvania Day Care Delivery System	5
A.	Structure and Funding Summary	5
B.	Costs of Operating One Federally-Funded 30-Child Day Care Center	6
III	Cost Reduction--Three Approaches	23
A.	Day Care Personnel Self-Evaluation	23
B.	Private Day Care Costs vs. Federal Day Care Costs	35
C.	Home Day Care	56
IV	Conclusion	64
	Summary of Findings and Recommendations	64

I Introduction

It is generally recognized that there is a tremendous need for quality day care in the United States which is not being satisfied by existing programs. Many newspaper articles and books which discuss the problem attribute the failure to meet this need to inadequate funding and recommend that the federal government enact comprehensive day care legislation which would provide a substantial increase in present funding.

One 1972 study, Windows on Day Care,[1] recommended a minimum $2 billion federal outlay for fiscal year 1973 to provide comprehensive day care services to an additional 400,000 children.[2] Additional increases of $2 billion were also recommended for fiscal years "well into the 1970's."

However the estimated federal funding level for day care services in fiscal year 1973 fell considerably short of the minimum $2 billion recommended by the "Windows" study. Sidney Johnson, Chief Staff Aide on the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, estimated that only $1 billion was spent for major child care programs. And although no accurate projections of federal day care appropriations are available for fiscal years 1974 and 1975, Maurice Cunningham,[3] an HEW official, has stated that he does not expect total funding for day care programs to reach the $2 billion mark in either year.

Recognizing the present limitations of funding forces one to consider an alternative approach to satisfying the tremendous demand for day care services. Consequently this study will consider the following question: Are there ways to reduce the cost of federally-funded day care programs, while maintaining quality, and thereby allow future federal funds to serve a greater number of children?

"Quality" day care service will be defined in this report according to standards outlined in the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements of September 23, 1968 and the Pennsylvania Title 4600 Regulations--Child Day Care Centers Under Social Services Auspices. All of the standards are based on the principle that day care is a service

1

57-649 O - 78 - pt. 4 - 2

which should satisfy the needs not only of the child, but also of the family and community. Specifically, the day care program must provide the following comprehensive services:[1]

I Child Services

A. Education

1. Educational activities must be provided to every child enrolled in the day care program. These activities must be designed to influence a positive concept of self and to enhance the child's social, cognitive, and communication skills.

2. Educational activities must be under the supervision and direction of a staff member trained or experienced in child growth and development.

B. Staff

1. For center care provided to children between the ages of three and five years: a. Children three to four years old must not be placed in a group of greater than 15. The total ratio of children to adults will not normally be greater than 5 to 1. b. Children four to six years old must not be placed in a group greater than 20. The total ratio of children to adults will not normally be greater than 7 to 1.

2. The operating or administrating agency must provide orientation and concontinuous in-service training for all staff involved in the day care program--professionals, non-professionals, and volunteers. Examples of topics that should be discussed in training sessions include nutrition, health, child growth and development, and reading and math techniques.

C. Health and Nutrition

1. Each child must receive dental, medical, and other health evaluations appropriate to his age upon entering the day care program and subsequently at intervals appropriate to his age and state of health.

2. Using existing community resources, arrangements must be made for medical and dental care and other health-related treatment[2] for each child. In the

[2]

absence of other financial resources, the operating or administrating agency must provide such treatment with its own funds.

3. The facility must provide adequate and nutritious meals and snacks prepared in a safe and sanitary manner.

II Family Services

1. Counseling and guidance must be provided to the family to help the parents determine the best type of day care program for the child.

2. Continued assessment of the child's adjustment to the day care program must be made by a social services staff member.

3. Referral procedures must be provided to permit the child and his family to obtain, if needed, assistance from other resources.

III Community Services

1. Agencies providing day care for more than 40 children must establish a policy advisory committee at the administrative level where most decisions are made. The committee must be permitted to assist in the development of the day care program; advise on the recruitment and selection of staff and volunteers; initiate suggestions for program improvement, and serve as a channel for hearing complaints.

2. The committee membership should include not less than 50 percent parents. Other members should include representatives of professional organizations or individuals who have a particular knowledge of child or family programs.

In looking for possible means of reducing day care costs, this study will not consider any procedures which would require lowering the federal or state regulations outlined above. The author of this report is not qualified to evaluate the effects of such changes on the present delivery of day care services.

The study will instead, examine the following four broad areas: 1. The structure of the Montgomery County federally-funded day care system will be explained to provide a basic understanding of how federal day care programs are administered at

the local level. The discussion will include a summary of total spending for fiscal year 1974 and a detailed examination of the cost of operating one 30-child center. The information provided in the second part of this section will establish a yearly cost-per-child figure which will be used as a base figure for this study. The remaining sections will consider three approaches to reducing day care center costs: 2. Recommendations from Day Care Administrators--Five Montgomery County day care administrators were asked to comment on the feasibility of cost reduction methods suggested by this researcher. These methods were developed with the assistance of Meade Breese, the Montgomery County Comprehensive Day Care Coordinator. Administrators were also asked to recommend cost reduction methods which they knew, through their own experience, could be implemented or at least considered by other program directors. 3. Comparison of operating costs between a federally-funded center and a privately-funded center--The operating costs of the 30-child, federally-funded center described in section one, were compared on a line-item basis with the lower operating costs of a 30-child privately-funded center. The comparison was made to determine if any private center procedures could be adopted by federal centers to reduce costs. 4. Consideration of the Family Day Care Home and its lower costs--The family day care home was shown to be a viable alternative to the day care center in providing quality day care service. The cost of operating one family day care home was extrapolated from the total budget for fiscal year 1974 in Montgomery County, to show in detail the lower costs. The two leading county day care administrators were also asked to comment on the feasibility of this alternative.

II The Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, Day Care Delivery System

A. Structure and Funding Summary

The first federal funds to support full-day, year-round day care in Montgomery County were expended in 1970. Under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act of 1967, the County Commissioners, acting as prime sponsors, contracted with the Day Care Association of Montgomery County, a private agency, to provide day care to 217 children from low income families. The total cost of the first contract was $640,663 of which 75% was federal support and 25% was state and local support. This funding formula is mandated by law.

Over the next two years, increased Title IV-A funding permitted the Day Care Association to open two new centers and enter into purchase of service agreements[1] with three existing centers. In addition, two independent centers began operation.

To coordinate the activities of the growing number of programs; to plan for possible expansion; and to act as a contracting agent, the County Commissioners created the Office of the Montgomery County Comprehensive Day Care Coordinator (OCDC) in 1972. The new office was given the primary responsibility of reviewing the yearly budget proposal to be sent to the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare for approval. (The D.P.W. administers all Title IV-A-funded day care programs operating in the Commonwealth.)

In addition to developing a comprehensive budget proposal, the OCDC was given the responsibility of interpreting the constantly changing federal and state day care regulations.

For fiscal year 1974, the OCDC has contracted with six agencies to provide day care to 514 children. The type of program and number of children served in each category is as follows:

1. Infant and Toddler	ages 2 months to 3 years	8
2. Pre-School	ages 3 years to 6 years	311[2]
3. School Age	ages 6 years to 16 years	100
4. Mentally Handicapped	ages 3 years to 6 years	20[3]
5. Family Day Care[5]	ages 2 months to 16 years	75
	Total	514

A general understanding of day care costs can be best obtained by dividing the total budget into cost categories. This report will use the eight categories established by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. The following chart will indicate spending in each category for fiscal year 1974 in Montgomery County. For convenience the costs have been listed in descending order according to their percentage of the total amount spent.

Category	Amount	% of Total
I Personnel	$727,650	74.1
II Consumable Supplies	88,457	8.9
III Space	55,289	5.6
IV DPW Administrative Costs (1/19 total budget)	49,161	5.0
V Contract and Consultation	24,283	2.5
VI Travel	14,597	1.5
VII Other Costs	14,277	1.4
VIII Equipment and Furniture	9,513	1.0
Total Program-Funded Contracts	$983,227	100.0%
Four Purchase of Service Contracts[1]	117,844	
Total	$1,161,071	

B. Costs of Operating One 30-Child Day Care Center

Because the greatest number of children served are enrolled in pre-school programs, the study will more closely examine the costs incurred in a program which provides care for children ages three to five years old. Although a tremendous demand exists for daycare programs serving other needs--especially those of after-school,"latch key" children and handicapped children--this report will restrict itself to evaluating pre-school program costs. Such an examination will establish a yearly cost-per-child figure for fiscal year 1974 to be used as

a base figure for additional discussion in this report.

The costs of the Crestmont Day Care Center were chosen to be evaluated because in Montgomery County, this program alone receives 100% of its funds from Title IV-A money. Other programs coordinated by the OCDC receive either some private funds or additional federal funding from other agencies. By considering Crestmont's costs, this study will not have to add or subtract amounts to arrive at accurate totals.

The Crestmont Center is under a purchase of service contract as opposed to a program-funded contract. The basic difference between the two arrangements is determined by when payment for service is made. In the former case, the program receives payment in advance[1] of services being rendered. The total budget is divided into twelve equal payments which are made by the OCDC at the beginning of each month. In the latter case,[2] the program receives payment after services are rendered. The total budget is divided into four unequal payments which are made by the state D.P.W. on a quarterly basis.

A second difference is related to the degree of control over program spending. Purchase of service program directors are not restricted to spending money within the limits defined by each line item of their budgets. They may, for example, spend more in one category and less in another than was originally indicated in their proposals--as long as all federal and state regulations are met. The opposite is true for program-funded directors. Their spending in each budget category is limited by the amount specified in their budget proposals. If more spending is desired in any category, they must present a change of budget request to the OCDC.

The appropriate contract arrangement worked out between the OCDC and the program is determined by the program's ability to borrow funds. Because the Crestmont Center does not have a source of credit or readily available reserve funds, it would never be able to meet payroll, rent, and other financial obligations under the reimbursement conditions of a program-funded contract. Other programs are in

a position to borrow money from a bank or from the treasury of a supporting agency. The Central Montgomery Mental Health-Mental Retardation Day Care Center for example, is a program-funded center because it is an MH-MR-related and it can request temporary financial assistance from the MH-MR Board of Directors, if it is needed.

Although the purchase of service contract appears to provide less control over spending than a program-funded contract, the County Day Care Coordinator has stated that the same amount of fiscal accountability exists in each arrangement. He explained that he and his staff maintain close contact with all program directors throughout the year to ensure constant compliance with federal and state regulations. This monitoring activity is not possible without periodic checks of expenditures.

Given a choice of contracting methods, the Coordinator would fund all programs on a purchase of service basis because he believes it gives programs the flexibility needed to operate most effectively and it greatly simplifies the bookkeeping process.

The following information presents the FY 1974 budget of the Crestmont Day Care Center as approved by the OCDC. According to the Crestmont director, actual spending in each budget category was close to the figures presented in this study. The sub-total, however, represents the exact amount that will be spent by June 30,1974. Any amounts which do not accurately represent real costs will be noted.

The budget format used in this section and other parts of the study is based on recommendations found in Proposal Development Guidelines for Title IV-A Day Care Programs, a Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare manual.

8

Crestmont Day Care Center FY 1974 Budget

Category	Amount	% of Total
I Personnel		
Full-Time		
Director	$10,000	
Head Teacher (four year-old children)	8,000	
Teacher Aide (four year-old children)	5,000	
Teacher (three year-old children)	7,000	
Teacher Aide (three year-old children)	5,000	
Music and Reading Teacher	6,800	
Part-Time		
Social Worker ($4.08/hr. x 20 hrs./wk. x 52wks.)	4,250	
Secretary/Bookkeeper (3.17/hr. x 20 hrs./wk. x 52 wks)	3,300	
Bus Driver (2.88/hr. x 20 hrs./wk. x 52 wks.)	3,000	
Cook (2.50/hr. x 20 hrs./wk. x 52 wks.)	2,600	
Maintenance (4.86/hr. x 10hrs./wk. x 52 wks.)	2,529	
Substitute Positions (2.75/hr x 40 hrs/wk x 20 wks 5 full-time w/ 10 sick days, 10 vacation 5 x 20 = 100 days = 20 weeks)	2,200	
Personnel Sub-Total	$59,679	
Fringe Benefits		
F.I.C.A. (5.85% x 59,679)	3,491	
Retirement (4% interest paid on employees' input, up to 10% of total salary)	294	
Hospitalization (3.48/mo. x 12 mo. x 7 employees)	292	
	$63,756	74.3%

Category	Amount	% of Total
II Consumable Supplies		
Food (.60/person/day x 40 x 250 days) [1]	$6,000	
Office Supplies (12.50/mo. x 12 mo.)	150	
Program Supplies (paper products, craft materials $75/mo. x 12 mo.)	900	
Janitorial Supplies ($30/mo. x 12mo.)	360	
	$7,410	8.6%
III Space		
Seventh Day Adventist Church, Willow Grove (basement) ($400/mo. x 12 mo.)	4,800	5.6%
IV Department of Public Welfare Administrative Cost (1/19 total contract, $81,529)	4,291	5.0%
V Contract and Consultation [2]		
Program Consultants: 1. Psychologist-two visits ($50/day x 5 days) 2. Program Consultant-three visits (reading, recreation, art) [3]	250	
Accountant ($100/visit x 4 visits)	400	
Payments on Bus ($167/mo. x 12 mo.) [4]	2,004	
	$2,654	3.1%
VI Other Expenses		
Postage (8.66/mo. x 12mo.)	104	
Telephone (25.00/mo. x 12 mo.)	300	
Insurance (accident and liability for children and staff)	600	
	$1,004	1.2%
VII Equipment and Furniture		
new cubbies	550	
new metal storage cabinets	220	
replacement of games	230	
[10]	$1,000	1.2%

Category		Amount	% of Total
VIII	Travel		
	Field Trips (.50 admission x 30 x 12 trips/yr)	180	
	(1.00 admission x 5 staff)	20	
	Bus Mileage (344 mi./mo. x 12 mo. x .12/mi.)	496	
	Staff Travel (Director and Social Worker approx. 70mi./mo each x 12 mo. x.12/mi.)	200	
		$896	1.0%
	TOTAL	$85,811	100.0%
Yearly cost-per-child = 85,811/30 =		$2,860	

To determine the yearly cost-per-child base figure, two methods may be employed. The total cost of program operation for the year can be divided by the total number of children enrolled, or by the average daily attendance number. The latter method is used in the 1971 Abt Associates study, Costs and Quality Issues for (Day Care)Operators, because it gives the cost of services actually delivered. The choice of this method appears to be valid for the Abt study because ADA was found to be 88% of the total enrollment of the thirteen centers examined. Thus, a significant difference existed between the number of children actually served and theoretically served.

Although the ADA for Crestmont for the 1973-74 program year is 90%, only slightly higher than the Abt figure, this study has used the total enrollment method to compute the yearly cost-per-child figure. This procedure acknowledges that all children enrolled in the program are entitled to receive care, and in fact, do receive it--but not 100% of the time. Furthermore, the ADA concept is misleading. It implies that only 88% of the total number of children enrolled are receiving care, when in fact, it only indicates that on a given day an average of

88% of the total number of children enrolled in the program are receiving care.

The total enrollment method can also be justified from an accountant's point of view. Approximately 75%, or the greatest part of the Crestmont budget, pays the salaries of the program staff. The size of the staff is determined primarily by federal and state child-adult ratio regulations which are based on total enrollment figures. Regardless of the number of children attending the program each day, the same number of teachers must be present.

Since the total enrollment figure is the determinant of the greatest part of the budget, it should be the determinant of the yearly cost-per-child figure. This accounting procedure has been suggested by Fry, Kimmel Associates, Certified Public Accountants, Norristown, a firm which audits the summer Head Start Day Care programs operating in Montgomery County.

Therefore, the yearly cost-per-child figure for the Crestmont program was computed by dividing the total cost of operation, $85,811, by the total number of children enrolled, 30, to yield $2,860.

To provide a more detailed explanation of program costs, every significant item in the Crestmont budget will be reviewed. Where applicable, federal and state regulations will be noted to show their effect on program costs.

I Personnel

Federal and state regulations do not prohibit center directors to assume teaching responsibilities. However all federally-funded programs in Montgomery County are administered by non-teaching directors. The wide range of responsibilities--fiscal, programmatic, personnel, and community, prevent directors from attempting to teach, even on a part-time basis.[1] The past experiences of directors who have assumed a teaching role has also proven that the director/teacher position is unworkable. At the present time, Joyce Hartsoe, Director of the Crestmont Center, feels that a full-time director for a center of 30 children is essential to maintain

sound program administration.

Federal and state regulations do mandate the number of teachers required for a program.[1] Children three to four years old must be placed in a group not to exceed 15, where the child-adult ration must not be greater than 5 to 1. Children four to five years old must be placed in a group not to exceed 20, where the child-adult ratio must not be greater than 7 to 1. The adult component is described as consisting of a teacher and sufficient assistants, supplimented by volunteers to meet the ratio requirements.

The Crestmont program includes one class of 14 children, three and four years old and one class of 16 children, four and five years old. Each group is supervised by a teacher and teacher assistant. In addition, a roving music and reading teacher spends equal time with both classes. Each group of children, therefore, has 2½ teachers working with them. Dividing 14 and 16 by 2½ (no volunteers on steady basis) equals 5 3/5 and 6 2/5 respectively. The class of three and four year olds exceeds the child-adult ratio by 3/5 and the class of four and five year olds is within the ratio limit. However the former group is considered within regulations according to the County Day Care Coordinator, because the language used in the regulation book states, "...the total ratio of children is normally not greater than 5 to 1." The Coordinator added that a violation, for all practical purposes, is usually considered when a program exceeds the ratio limit by greater than one.

Federal and state regulations mandate the provision of social services.[2] The duties of a social worker are defined in the state regulations as the procedures necessary to provide for the admission of a child into a program, to ensure his maximum benefit from participation, and to offer additional services which may be required for the child and/or his family. The social worker position is funded for 20 hours a week at Crestmont because additional funds were not available. The lack of money has prevented the social worker from contacting parents as often as necessary, however additional funding for fiscal year 1975 is expected to permit the

13

director to make the position full-time.

Federal regulations make no reference to secretary/bookkeepers. However state regulations specify that day care centers "shall have adequate clerical services to keep correspondence, records, accounts, and files current and in good order."[1] Ms. Hartsoe hired a part-time secretary/bookkeeper when she became director of the program in 1972, to handle all correspondence, maintain payroll records,and assist in the ordering of supplies.

Transportation to the day care center is not required by federal or state regulations. Whether a bus and bus driver are needed is determined by local program directors when they decide on the geographical boundaries of the area to be served by the center. Usually, however, the boundaries are pre-determined by the number of financially eligible children living in the vicinity of the day care facility.

The need for transportation is also based on the parents' ability to drive their children to the center every morning. If a substantial portion of the parents do not own cars or must leave for work before the center opens at 7:30 A.M., then transportation will be provided to a greater number of children.

Crestmont serves approximately a three square mile area and provides transportation to 17 children, or 57% of the total number of children enrolled in the program. The remaining 13 children live in walking distance of the center and are accompanied each day by their parents, brothers and sisters, or relatives. The Crestmont director prefers the latter arrangement because it permits closer contact with the families of the children and increases their involvement in the program.

State regulations require that either a cook be hired or that the services of a licensed caterer be purchased.[2] In addition, state nutritional requirements specify that a hot lunch and two snacks be served to the children every day.[3] A cook works at the Crestmont Center for four hours every day, planning and preparing meals.

State regulations also require all centers to staff a janitor "so that buildings, grounds, and equipment are well-maintained."[1] A cleaning woman works at Crestmont for approximately two hours every day.

Vacation and sick days as indicated in the budget on page nine, must be provided according to state regulations.[2] Substitute costs therefore, are required so that the program can meet child-adult ratio regulations at all times.

Fringe benefits must also be provided according to state regulations.[3] Day care employees in the centers discussed in this report are considered employees of Montgomery County and are entitled to county employee benefits as indicated in the budget on page nine.

In summary, personnel costs, more than any other area of the budget, are subject to federal and state regulations. Ten out of twelve positions (including substitute positions) are mandated. Five of the ten positions--all teaching, are full-time. And a non-teaching director, although not mandated, is essential to any day care program which is to be run efficiently. Only the bus driver is truly an optional position.

Although federal and state regulations mandate the establishment of positions, they do not set salary guidelines. Therefore it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine a definitive spending level required by them. Thus, a subjective judgement must be relied upon, if the effect of the regulations on total spending is to be quantified.

If one accepts that Crestmont salaries are appropriate to the positions, then it can be said that $49,409, or 58% of total program cost,[4] must be spent to meet federal and state regulations,[5] and an additional $10,000 must be spent if the program is to operate effectively.

II Consumable Supplies

State regulations require that a hot lunch and two snacks be served daily. By summer 1974, Crestmont hopes to obtain approximately 10% of its food from

government surplus distribution and thereby lower food costs. However the present cost of providing one person lunch and two snacks is expected to be considerably lower than .60/day.

Consumable program supplies make up one percent of the budget at a cost of $900 a year. Ms. Hartsoe and other program directors consider this to be one of the most important parts of the budget. Construction paper, paste, puzzles, crayons, pencils, building blocks, and transportation and housekeeping toys are considered important learning tools for children between the ages of three and five. Federal and state regulations require that each facility must have toys, games, equipment, and material for the educational development of the children enrolled in the day care program.[1]

III Space

The Crestmont program is located in the basement of the Seventh Day Adventist Church of Willow Grove. One 37' x 40' room provides space for a wide range of program activities, free play, and rest. In the morning, a partition is used to divide the area into two rooms to reduce noise levels and to permit each class to work without distractions. The basement also includes a kitchen and toilet facilities. These arrangements, at a cost of $400/month, meet all minimum federal requirements for space.[2]

IV Department of Public Welfare Administrative Costs

The Pennsylvania D.P.W. administers all Title IV-A programs operating throughout the state. It obtains funds by charging each program 1/19 of the total cost of operation. Philadelphia regional administrators were unable to explain how the cost formula was determined.

The D.P.W. is supposed to send field workers to day care centers to provide staff training and to assist directors with general problems. However the office is greatly understaffed and does not have enough field personnel to provide assistance to all programs. Ms. Hartsoe, for example, has only received direct assistance once

in the two years that she has been the director of the Crestmont program.

According to Meade Breese, the County Day Care Coordinator, the only service the D.P.W. offers to day care programs is providing technical assistance to county-wide day care administrators in the development of comprehensive yearly budgets.

However it is not the intention of this report to criticize the state agency. These observations have been made only to explain briefly, how the 1/19 funds are used--in theory and fact. To fully evaluate the effectiveness of the D.P.W. requires a separate study.

V Contract and Consultation Services

Federal and state regulations require that in-service training be provided to all staff members to improve general and specific components of the day care program.[1] The choice of components is determined by local administrators.

The Crestmont director, however, did not use the $250 to bring program consultants to the center as planned by most other Title IV-A centers in Montgomery County. Instead, she sent staff members to free workshops sponsored by Day Care Services, an agency of the Philadelphia school district. The $250 budgeted for training was used instead, for other program expenditures.[2]

The information contained in the Contract and Consultation category on page ten is based on the training programs of other Title IV-A centers. It is presented to show one possible in-center plan that might have been developed: Psychological consultants visit day care centers to observe the behavior of children to determine if any individual social or emotional problems exist. The consultants also discuss educational methods of alleviating the problems. Program consultants, teachers or professors with expertise in a particular program activity, also visit the centers to conduct training sessions. Since the program day is a long one, a variety of activities are required to properly stimulate the children. Most day care teachers feel that their skills are deficient in at least one activity area and therefore believe the training is vital. Reading, art, and recreation training sessions are

three programs, in addition to psychological consultation, that might have been arranged for the Crestmont staff. They were, in fact, provided at the Day Care Services workshops.

Neither federal or state regulations mandate the services of an accountant. However the Crestmont director has budgeted this service to provide, primarily, quarterly tax assistance. This item does not appear in the budgets of any other Montgomery County Title IV-A programs because they either receive full-time bookkeeping services or financial assistance from a program-related agency.

Federal and state regulations do not require that transportation be provided. If it is to be made available, the program director must determine whether a bus should be leased or purchased. Since a purchase arrangement is less expensive, Crestmont and all Title IV-A centers providing transportation have bought vans. Past experience has shown that these vehicles must be replaced approximately every five years.

VI Other Expenses

Neither federal or state regulations require the provision of insurance. (It is required for transportation.) However all Montgomery County Title IV-A centers carry accident and liability policies for children and staff. The cost varies according to the number of people requiring coverage.

VII Equipment and Furniture

Federal regulations are primarily concerned with the adequacy of the facility itself. There are no directives concerning furniture and heavy equipment. State regulations however, require a "sufficient" quantity of tables and chairs constructed of "safe material." Start up costs are extremely high--they often include kitchen equipment, plumbing repairs and additions, and repairs to meet health and building codes. In the second and third years of operation however, costs drop to approximately $1,000 a year and drop even lower in subsequent years if enrollment does not increase. The items in the Crestmont budget are representative of second year costs.

18

VIII Travel

Field trips are not discussed either in federal or state regulations. Ms. Hartsoe believes that they are an integral part of the day care program, broadening the child's understanding of the world. She also believes that the trips are experiences which would not be provided by the children's families due to lack of money. Typical trips include a visit to the zoo a boat trip on the Delaware River, an Easter show in Philadelphia, and trips to a farm, local firehouse, and police station. Ms. Hartsoe tries to schedule one free admission and one paid admission trip each month.

Summary

Providing a detailed explanation of program costs has shown more than anything else, that day care program expenditures are largely determined by federal and state regulations. In fact, Travel and Other Expenses are the only budget categories which are entirely free of mandated expenditures.

However to establish an exact spending level required by the regulations is very difficult, if not impossible, because the regulations do not set spending ceilings. Nevertheless, recognizing these limitations, this study will attempt to establish a required spending figure for the Crestmont program based on the budget analysis presented on the previous pages.

The appropriateness of every Crestmont expenditure might be supported on two grounds: 1. The County Day Care Coordinator has stated that Crestmont's yearly cost-per-child figure for fiscal year 1974 is the same as the Title IV-A county-wide average. 2. Personnel costs, which represent 75% of the budget, have been restrained--teacher salaries are approximately $800 lower than those received by public school kindergarten teachers[1]; five positions are part-time; and no salary exceeds $10,000.

Because this is a partially subjective proof of reasonable spending, it may be argued that the costs in several, or even all regulated categories were excessive and that the regulations could have been met at a lower total cost. However, if

one does accept that the costs in each category were appropriate for the goods and services purchased, than it can be concluded that 77.9% of the Crestmont program's total cost--or nearly 80%--was mandated by federal and state regulations.

The chart on the following pages places all expenditures in one of two categories--mandated and not mandated--and shows exactly how the percentage above was computed. Since only a small portion of the budget--approximately 20%--is not subject to regulations, cost reduction possibilities are limited. Nevertheless, the second part of this study will consider recommendations to reduce day care costs in all spending categories.

Extent of Federal and State Regulations in Determining

FY 1974 Expenditurer at the Crestmont Center

Categories and Items	Mandated	Not Mandated
I Personnel		
Director		$10,000
Teacher	$8,000	
Teacher Aide	5,000	
Teacher	7,000	
Teacher Aide	5,000	
Music and Reading Teacher	6,800	
Social Worker	4,250	
Secretary/Bookkeeper	3,300	
Cook	2,600	
Maintenance	2,529	
Substitute Positions	2,200	
Bus Driver		3,000
F.I.C.A.[1]	2,731	760
Retirement[2]	294	
Hospitalization[2]	292	
II Consumable Supplies		
Food[3]	6,000	
Office Supplies		150
Janitorial Supplies[4]	360	
Program Supplies (games, toys)	900	
III Space		
Rent	4,800	
IV Department of Public Welfare Costs		
1/19 total program cost	4,291	

21

Categories and Items	Mandated	Not Mandated
V Contract and Consultation[5]		
Program Consultants[6]	250	
Accountant		400
Bus Payments		2,004
VI Other Expenses		
Postage		104
Telephone		300
Insurance		600
VII Equipment and Furniture		
Cubbies		550
Cabinets		220
Replacement of Games[7]	230	
VIII Travel		
Field Trips		200
Bus Mileage		496
Staff Travel		200
Totals	$66,827	$18,984
% of Total Budget	77.9%	22.1%

1. Director and Driver included--amount should be slightly lower

2. $760 represents F.I.C.A. for Director and Driver

3. Actual cost is less--discussed later in study

4. State regulation requiring janitorial service, by extension, would apply to supplies

5. All children were eligible for D.P.W. medical assistance payments. Therefore all costs of medical screening were paid without program funds. However any child not eligible for medical assistance must have his screening paid by day care program

6. Teachers attended free workshops--money used for other expenditures

7. Placed in mandated category by researcher's interpretation of state regulation #4654A (Title 4600) requiring "sufficient quantity of safe and suitable equipment...

III Cost Reduction--Three Approaches

A. Day Care Personnel Self-Evaluation

Five day care administrators in Montgomery County were interviewed to obtain information for this section of the study. They were chosen because each one is familiar with a different aspect of the problems of day care delivery:

Ruth Mayden, Executive Director of the Day Care Association of Montgomery County (DCAMC), is responsible for the overall operation of five day care programs in seven locations. Florence Nedell, Director of the Conshohocken Day Care Center (DCAMC), is familiar with the problems of renting space from a private, commercial owner. Karen Perrott, Director of the Main Line Day Care Center (DCAMC), understands the advantages and disadvantages of running a program in a public school. Phyllis Borland, Director of the North Hills Day Care Center, administers the only program in Montgomery County receiving Title IV-A and Head Start funds. Joyce Hartsoe, Director of the Crestmont program has spent a great deal of time evaluating transportation services.

Although program costs are greatly restricted by federal and state regulations, the five administrators were asked to consider every category of their budgets and offer cost reduction recommendations based on practice and theory. They were also asked to comment on three cost reduction suggestions made by the researcher. The recommendations and remarks that follow should not be considered a complete answer to how costs can be reduced. They only provide a partial response to a very complex question and hopefully will stimulate additional comments.

First, each administrator responded to the researcher's questions: Could the responsibilities of a director and a teacher be assumed by one individual to lower personnel costs? All five administrators opposed the creation of a director/teacher position, stating that the amount of responsibilities of such a job would make effective program administration extremely difficult.

Phyllis Borland and Karen Perrott based their responses on personal experience.

Both felt that the responsibilities they had assumed--hiring personnel, purchasing supplies, teaching classes, and meeting with parents and staff--were overwhelming.

Ruth Mayden qualified her response, adding that a director/teacher could properly administer a one-classroom program. However according to federal and state regulations, class size cannot exceed 20 children and operation of a center of this size would not be economical. Thus, for all practical purposes, a director/teacher position was not recommended for center operation by any of the five administrators interviewed.

Could volunteers be used to replace full-time staff positions?--The second question evoked another unanimous response from the administrators. All, for different reasons, stated that volunteers should be used to supplament, but never to replace staff.

Florence Nedell has discovered that many people wishing to volunteer are too old and therefore physically incapable of working with active young children. Others, she said could not afford to work without pay for an extended period of time. She concluded that a volunteer cook would perhaps be most useful to a center because the extensive training needed to be given to volunteers to teach classes would not be necessary.

Karen Perrott also discussed the issue of providing training to volunteers. Since no one on her staff has time to provide the training, Ms. Perrott feels that a paid volunteer supervisor would be needed to coordinate the activities of unpaid help. It is questionable though, whether any savings would be realized. At the present time however, early childhood education students serve successfully as aides and substitute teachers in Ms. Perrott's centers. This arrangement does not actually reduce costs, rather it prevents them from going up.

Ruth Mayden's comments were not encouraging. She noted that many volunteers with day care experience could not be relied upon to come to centers on a regular basis because of family responsibilities. And she added that staff supervisors are reluctant

to train volunteers because of the usual temporary nature of their jobs.

Therefore, the only recommendation to emerge from this section would be to urge directors to consider utilizing college students studying early childhood education, as aides and substitutes.

When the administrators were asked for general recommendations, Joyce Hartsoe, Director of the Crestmont Center, suggested that transportation services to and from centers be re-evaluated to determine if the bus drivers' hours can be reduced.

Prompted by the severe gasoline shortages experienced last winter, Ms. Hartsoe eliminated transportation provided to all children living in walking distance of the center. This action cut the number of children served from 30, the total enrollment of the center, down to 17, a reduction of 43%. Before the reduction in service, the bus driver made two trips in the morning and two trips in the afternoon. The number of trips was cut in half as a result of the change.

According to Ms. Hartsoe, parents affected by the reduction accepted the decision and have either accompanied their children to and from the center, or have arranged for older brothers and sisters or relatives to do so. Furthermore, no children have been withdrawn from the center and average daily attendance has remained the same as before the change.

Although the Crestmont driver presently spends only 10 hours each week transporting the children, she continues to work a 20-hour week, providing miscellaneous services for the center. However she will be leaving the program in the near future, at which time Ms. Hartsoe will change the driver position to a 10-hour job and reduce the pay from $3,000 to $1,500. Additional savings derived from the F.I.C.A reduction--5.85% of $1,500--will bring the total personnel savings to $1,588. An estimated 80 miles/month reduction of gas consumption[1] will save another $115 each year, which added to the total amount saved equals $1,700. This amount is approximately 60% of the $2,860 yearly cost-per-child at the Crestmont Center. It is enough to provide day care to one additional child for seven months.

25

Some programs, such as Conshohocken and North Hills, do not provide transportation because all of the children served live in the immediate area and can walk to the centers. Other programs such as Main Line, do provide transportation to children who do not live within walking distance of one of the two centers. However, the child's distance from the center need not be the only criteria used to determine whether transportation should be provided.

The Ambler Day Care Center (DCAMC), troubled by frequent bus repairs, decided in February 1974, to conduct a one-month experiment of not providing transportation to the 14 children out of 28 enrolled who did not live within walking distance of the center. It was hoped that with less use, the bus could continue to be used for field trips and that the purchase of a new vehicle could be postponed for at least another year.

The parents of all but two of the affected children agreed to form carpools and the resulting vacancies were quickly filled. Average daily attendance remained the same as before the experiment and the results were so encouraging that transportation services were suspended permanently in the beginning of March.

As a result of the change, the director was able to eliminate the bus driver position entirely, a yearly savings of $2,400 in salary plus $140 in F.I.C.A., yielding a total savings of $2,540. (Information pertaining to gas savings was not available.) The money saved will be used for unanticipated transportation expenses incurred by another DCAMC center.

Transportation is one of the few components of the day care program which is not mandated by federal or state regulations. It is also one of the few components, which if reduced or eliminated, would not result in lowering the quality of a program. Both the Crestmont and Ambler program directors can attest to the accuracy of this statement based on their experiences. The Crestmont experience in particular, shows that obvious methods of cost reduction can often be overlooked. The Ambler experience demonstrates the importance of using parent participation to help a day care program operate more efficiently.

These two programs alone, saved $4,240 in transportation personnel costs.[1] A nationwide review of day care transportation arrangements could probably save several thousand dollars more.

Additional suggestions for reducing personnel costs could not be provided because federal and state regulations mandate all other positions (except non-teaching Director) and establish strict child-adult ratios. And according to Ruth Mayden, Executive Director of DCAMC, personnel costs will probably rise in the future due to the increase in the number of college students trained in early childhood education who will be able to command higher salaries.

Consumable Supplies

Once again, federal and state regulations pre-determine the level of spending to a great extent and therefore cost reduction suggestions are limited.

Ms. Nedell and Ms. Hartsoe pointed out that paper is wasted more than any other item. Both agreed that the best method for controlling waste was appealing to the children and staff on an individual basis, to use paper and other construction materials completely, before using more.

Phyllis Borland, Director of the North Hills program, explained that the Pennsylvania Special Food Services Program for Children, although it pays her center's food costs up to .55/child/day, is wasteful. Since program regulations require all purchases to be invoiced, Ms. Borland can only shop in small, higher-priced stores, where personnel have the time to write out the entire order. She recommended that the invoice regulation be suspended and replaced by a periodic field check by state officials to determine that proper food items were in fact, being purchased. At the present time, Ms. Borland estimated that her food costs are between 5% and 10% higher than necessary.

No additional recommendations were made by other administrators and unfortunately increasing food costs promise to raise the level of consumable supplies spending higher in the near future. Based on the five interviews, it seems that consumable supplies costs cannot be significantly reduced.

Space

Discussions about space costs revealed the greatest cost discrepancies between centers of any one category: The North Hills program, located in the North Hills Community Center, contributes $100 each month for the center's utilities but does not pay rent. The Crestmont program, located in the basement of the Seventh Day Adventist Church of Willow Grove, pays $400 each month for rent and yet does not have exclusive use of the facilities. The Main Line program has two locations. It pays $385 each month for two classrooms and janitorial services in St. Mary's Church, Ardmore and $500 each month for three classrooms and janitorial services at the Lower Merion High School, also in Ardmore. The Conshohocken program is presently located in a commercial building on Fayette Street in Conshohocken. It pays $1,000 each month for use of the entire building. However because the facility violates safety codes, the program will be moving to a church across the street in early June 1974. The rent will be $800 each month.

If nothing else, the comparison of five centers shows a wide range of rental costs--from no cost to $1000/month. However it also dramatizes the fact that day care programs must pay whatever is asked by the lessor. And although it cannot be proven without a comparison of cost-per-square-foot statistics, several day care administrators feel that they are overcharged, based on the belief that federally-funded programs have "plenty of money." Because adequate facilities for day care programs are difficult to find, administrators often feel that they do not have an alternative to high rents and thus, are forced to accept space at whatever terms that are offered.

One solution to the problem of cost discrepancies and excesses might be a cost-per-square-foot federal regulation establishing maximum rental costs for various facilities[1]. The regulation would have the effect of proving to lessors that federal funds for day care programs are limited and would hopefully encourage them to offer space at rates in line with the rental costs of similar facilities. All of the administrators supported the recommendation for an additional regulation.

28

Asked what type of facility they considered ideal for a day care program, the administrators stated that one best-suited facility does not exist. The type of building--church, school, or community center--is not as important as the individual features it contains such as a well-equipped kitchen, ample indoor and outdoor space, convenient location of bathrooms, and the proximity of the center to the homes of the children.

However a brief discussion of the Main Line program located at the Lower Merion High School shows that schools can offer special benefits which are not available in other locations. For example, the children at Main Line are exposed to a greater variety of activities at no additional cost. They attend school orchestra performances and sports events and they use special school facilities such as the swimming pool and planetarium. Day care classrooms receive school janitorial services and lunch is prepared in the school cafeteria and wheeled into classrooms at a lower cost-per-child than other Title IV-A centers in Montgomery County.[1]

Karen Perrott, Main Line's director, is quick to point out that certain disadvantages exist too. Classes are frequently disturbed by visiting brothers, sisters, and relatives; corridor traffic often confuses the younger children and places a strain on teachers; and bathroom facilities located outside the classrooms necessitate scheduled group visits which also break up activities. She did suggest however, that if a program were located in an elementary school and classrooms were designed with separate bathroom facilities, running water, and separate play areas, such an arrangement would be superior to other situations.

The results of an OEO day care cost study conducted in 1971 revealed that the yearly-cost-per-child declines as the center size increases.[2] With this information in mind, the researcher asked the third question: Could administrators recommend the establishment of quality day care centers serving more than 30 children (the size of the Crestmont program)? If so, what would be the maximum recommendation?

All of the administrators agreed that quality day care centers could be

established to serve more than 30 children. In fact, at the present time, Phyllis Borland and Florence Nedell run centers serving 45 and 50 children respectively. Maximum recommendations however, varied from 60 children, suggested by Joyce Hartsoe, Director of the Crestmont program, to "no limit, provided that adequate facilities are available," suggested by Ms. Borland.

Ms. Hartsoe felt that a maximum number was needed to prevent programs from becoming overly"institutionalized." However Ms. Borland, Director of the North Hills program, believed that children could continue to receive individualized attention as long as classroom sizes and child-adult ratios established in federal and state regulations were followed.

Determining a maximum enrollment number cannot be resolved in this study, nor is it important. It is more significant to note that all of the administrators agreed that program sizes could be increased, at least to 60 children, which according to the OEO study, would result in the yearly savings of approximately $126 per child. They also agreed that larger program size is dependent, almost entirely,on finding facilities which would provide adequate indoor space to permit children to be active--especially on rainy days.

In summary, the comments made by the administrators do not provide a recommendation to be made concerning the type of facility day care centers should use. They do suggest however, the creation of federal regulations setting up a rental cost ceiling and the establishment of larger day care centers given that adequate facilities can be found.

D.P.W. Administrative Costs

State administrative regulations have determined that the Department of Public Welfare shall receive operating funds by charging Title IV-A day care programs 1/19 of their total cost. Therefore the cost of this category of day care budgets cannot

be reduced. However improving the quality of the services provided by the D.P.W. is an issue which could be considered.

As discussed earlier in this study, the D.P.W. provides little or no direct service to day care programs because it is greatly understaffed. Of the five administrators interviewed, only two have ever received direct assistance from the agency.

Without more staff though, it is unrealistic to expect programs to receive badly needed services such as yearly audits and inspections of facilities. Ruth Mayden, Executive Director of the Montgomery County Day Care Association, emphasized that understaffing of the D.P.W. means that day care programs are almost entirely free of monitoring and therefore, state and federal government officials must recognize that the rising cost of providing day care may be due, in part, to lack of D.P.W. control. She suggested that the D.P.W.'s ability to administer day care programs be carefully analyzed. "The expenditure of funds for additional staff to monitor programs, might result in an overall savings in day care costs," she said.

Further evaluation of the operation of the D.P.W. is beyond the scope of this study. The complex internal structure of the agency requires that a separate study be undertaken to identify problems and to make recommendations for improved operation.

Contract and Consultation -

Program consultant costs, a part of this category, only represent 2½% of total spending for day care in Montgomery County. Nevertheless, these expenditures should be examined because all of the administrators interviewed agreed that a portion of the costs could be reduced through a greater utilization of group training workshops.

At the present time, most centers meet federal and state regulations which require the provision of in-service staff training, by hiring program consultants. Usually consultants come directly to the centers to conduct training sessions on topics such as reading, math, music, and art skills and the psychological and social problems of pre-school children. The latter session often involves the

observation of children with specific problems and discussion of classroom methods that teachers can use to help children overcome their difficulties.

However with the exception of psychological consulting work, and some administrators feel it need not be excluded, the training sessions held at centers could be conducted on a conference-workshop basis to benefit the staffs of several day care centers.

Experience has shown that the cost of group training is considerably lower than individual center consulting. In August 1973, Phyllis Borland, Director of the North Hills Day Care Center, coordinated a six-day conference attended by over 200 day care teachers and administrators. Each day approximately 35 people attended all-day training sessions.[1] The total cost of the conference, funded by a federal grant and nominal registration fees, was $1,100.[2] Assuming that the typical Montgomery County day care center has ten staff members who would benefit from training, and a consultant charges $75 a day[3] to provide training, then it would cost $262.50 to provide training to 35 people on an individual center basis for one day and $1,575 for six days. Therefore a total savings of $475 could be realized if individual centers participated in group training sessions.

Day care program staffs in Montgomery County can also benefit from the Day Care Services workshops open to all staff and parents of Title IV-A centers. The conferences are funded in part, by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. Greater participation in the sessions would not only lower consultant costs but would increase the effectiveness of D.P.W. funds presently spent. Crestmont Center staff members attended several Day Care Services conferences in 1973-74 and saved the entire cost of hiring consultants.

Since the County Day Care Coordinator is in the best position to organize group training programs, implementation of the change from center training would have to come from his office. Meade Breese, the Montgomery County Coordinator has said he is seriously interested in using training conferences to a greater extent. He

noted however, that some training sessions, such as psychological consulting, are most effective when the consultant visits the center. All of the administrators agreed though, that conferences are not utilized as much as they could and that the cost of consultants could be lowered through group training sessions.

Other Costs/Equipment and Furniture

Since travel costs were discussed in the personnel section, only these two categories remain to be considered. None of the administrators could recommend methods of reducing these expenditures. All stated that "sound business practices"--shopping comparatively, buying quality equipment and taking care of equipment--were the best ways to keep costs to a minimum.

A review of the ideas presented in part two of the study shows four suggestions were made for reducing operating costs: 1. Transportation services can be reduced or discontinued at some centers with no decline in attendance or program quality. 2. Rental costs might be lowered by establishing federal day care center rent ceiling regulations--maximum cost-per-square-foot guidelines for different facilities. 3. Consultant costs can be lowered at all centers by replacing individual center training sessions with group training conferences set up by the County Coordinator and by utilizing existing free workshops to a greater extent. 4. Total costs could be reduced if programs could relocate to larger facilities and increase enrollment.[1]

The savings in transportation costs was estimated to be $4,240 a year, based on the experiences of the Crestmont and Ambler day care centers. The rental savings could not be estimated. The consultant cost reduction was computed as $475 for the staff of 3½ centers, or approximately $1,225 for the nine Title IV-A centers in Montgomery County. And the total cost savings from increased center sizes was estimated to be $126/child, or approximately $3,780 if a center of 30 was doubled to 60 children. The total amount saved--$9,245--is enough to provide day care to three more children for one year.

But day care costs, like all others, are subject to variables which cause

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 4 - 4

increases. For example, Ms. Hayden mentioned that transportation services for the Ambler center may be resumed because of a shift in the location of children who will be enrolled in the 1974-75 program. Therefore cost reduction recommendations, at least the first one, must be seen as possibilities for both permanent and temporary savings.

Since only four recommendations emerged in this section, and they were all qualified, a second approach to cost savings should be considered. The next section of this study will examine the lower costs of a private day care program, similar to Crestmont, to determine if certain private center procedures could be adopted by federal programs.

III Cost Reduction--Three Approaches

B. Private Day Care Costs vs. Federal Day Care Costs

Program costs are largely determined by the number of children enrolled and the amount of time the program operates. To a lesser extent, they are also determined by the ages of the children (infant, pre-school, school age).[1] If a valid comparison is to be made between the lower costs of a private program and a federal program (Crestmont), than these three factors should be the same for each program.

The Crestmont Center, as described earlier, provides day care to 30 children between the ages of three and five years old, on a full-day, year-round basis. To find an identical private program, the researcher consulted the Directory of Early Childhood Programs in Montgomery County, a comprehensive listing of more than 90 federally and privately funded programs,compiled by the Montgomery County Comprehensive Day Care Office. Only one program, the Grace Mennonite Church Child Day Care Center, in Lansdale, was identical in all three ways.

Unfortunately, the program's financial planning is based on a calendar year rather than a fiscal year and therefore the accuracy of GMC's budgeted costs in April, when the researcher reviewed the budget, was not as certain as the accuracy of Crestmont's budgeted costs. However there was no alternative to examining the 1974 figures. The 1973 budget could not be studied because the program expanded from 15 to 30 children in the middle of the year. Although this qualification exists, GMC was chosen as the privately funded center to be examined.

The comparison between the two programs will be undertaken in three parts: First, the GMC 1974 budget will be presented by category, in the order of descending cost. Then each category will be analyzed to determine: 1. where GMC's costs were either lower than Crestmont's or eliminated entirely 2. what factors permitted the reduction or elimination. Finally, the reduction and/or elimination factors will be analyzed in an effort to answer the following question."Can any GMC practices be adopted by Crestmont and other federally funded programs, to reduce their costs?"

The following information presents the 1974 budget as developed by David Hersh, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Grace Mennonite Church. According to Mr. Hersh, most of the spending levels were computed on the basis of last year's actual costs. The budget format used in this section, as with the Crestmont presentation, is based on Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare guidelines.

Grace Mennonite Church Child Day Care Center
Budget 1974

Category		Amount	% of Total
I Personnel			
Full-Time			
Director/Teacher (4-5 year-olds)		$7,800	
Assistant Director/Teacher (3 year-olds)		6,760	
1 Teacher Aide (4-5 year-olds)		5,460	
2 Teacher Aide (4-5 year-olds)/Cook		4,550	
Part-Time			
Social Worker (4.50/hr x 4hrs/wk x52 wks)		936	
Teacher Aide (3 year-olds 2.50/hr. x 28hrs/wk x 52 wks)		3,640	
Teacher Aide (3 year-olds 2.50/hr. x 20hrs/wk x 52 wks)		2,600	
Custodian (2.00/hr x 5hrs/wk x 52 wks)		624	
1 Substitute Positions: (2.50/hr x 40hrs/wk x 12 wks six staff w/ 2wks vacation)		1,200	
(2.50/hr x 8hrs/day x 15 days six staff w/ 2½ sick days)		300	
	Sub Total	$33,870	
Fringe Benefits			
F.I.C.A. (5.85% of $33,870)		1,981	
	Total	$35,851	83.3%

36

Category	Amount	% of Total
II Consumable Supplies		
Food (approx. $.34 per person/day x 35 x 250 days)	$3,000	
Office Supplies (41.80/mo x 12 mo)	500	
Program Supplies (consumables, 91.66/mo x 12 mo)	1,100	
	$4,600	10.6%
III Equipment		
1. storage units for books and toys 2. outdoor play equipment 3. indoor play equipment	$1,090	2.6%
IV Space		
no rent		
utilities (approx. 83.33/mo x 12 mo)	1,000	2.2%
V Travel		
Staff travel (social worker and cook)	350	0.9%
VI Other Costs		
Telephone (12.50/mo x 12 mo)	150	
Postage (included in office supplies)	-	
Insurance (paid by church)	-	
	$ 150	0.4%
VII Contract and Consultation		
none	-	0%
VIII Department of Public Welfare Costs		
none	-	0%
Total	$43,041	100.0%
Yearly cost-per-child 43,041/30 =	$1,434	

Income		Amount
Parent Fees ($25/wk x 30 x 52 wks)		$39,000
Pennsylvania Food Services Program (reimbursement)		3,000
North Penn United Fund		1,200
	Total	$42,840
Expenses		43,041
Income		- 42,840
Paid by church loan	Deficit	$ 201

The chart of the following pages compares the costs in each category of the GMC budget with the costs in the Crestmont budget. The amount of money saved by the GMC program, indicated in a third column, will point out which expenditures, or lack thereof, must be analyzed to make reduction recommendations for federally-funded programs.

Grace Mennonite Church--Crestmont Program Cost Comparison

Grace Mennonite Church		Crestmont Center		GMC Savings
Line Item	Amount	Line Item	Amount	Amount
I Personnel				
Director/Teacher(4)	$7,800	Director	$10,000	
		Teacher (4)	8,000	$10,200
Asst. Dir./Teacher(3)	6,760	Teacher (3)	7,000	240
2 P-T Teacher Aides(4)	7,735	F-T Teacher Aide(4)	5,000	-2,735
2 P-T Teacher Aides(3)	6,240	F-T Teacher Aide(3)	5,000	-1,240
not req'd to meet child/adult regs.	-	Music & Reading Teacher	6,800	6,800
no Sec'y/Bkkpr.	-	Sec'y/Bkkpr.	3,300	3,300
no Bus Driver	-	Bus Driver	3,000	3,000
Social Worker	936	Social Worker	4,250	3,314
Maintenance	624	Maintenance	2,529	1,905
Cook	2,275	Cook	2,600	325
F.I.C.A.	1,981	F.I.C.A.	3,491	1,510
Subsitute Positions	1,500	Substitute Positions	2,200	700
no Fringe Benefits (other than F.I.C.A.)	-	Fringe Benefits (other than F.I.C.A.)	586	586
	$35,851		$63,756	$27,905
II Consumable Supplies				
Food	3,000	Food	6,000	3,000
Office Supplies	500	Office Supplies	150	-350
Program Supplies (consumables)	1,100	Program Supplies (consumables)	1,260	160
	$4,600		$7,410	$2,810
III Equipment				
Total	$1,090	Total	1,000	-90

39

Grace Mennonite Church		Crestmont Center		GMC Savings
Line Item	Amount	Line Item	Amount	Amount
IV Space				
Rent paid by church	-			
Utilities	$1,000	Rent & Utilities	$4,800	$3,800
V Travel				
no Field Trips	-	Field Trips	200	200
no Bus Mileage	-	Bus Mileage	496	496
Staff	350	Staff	200	-150
	350		896	546
VI Contract and Consultation				
no costs	-	Consultants	250	250
		Accountant	400	400
		Bus Payments	2,004	2,004
	-		$2,654	$2,654
VII Other Costs				
Telephone	150	Telephone	300	150
Postage	*	Postage	104	104*
Insurance	-	Insurance	600	600
	150		$1,004	854
VIII Department of Public Welfare Costs				
no costs	-	1/19 of total	$4,291	$4,291
Totals	$43,041		$85,811	$42,770

* Postage costs not available--savings figure not valid

Each line item comparison which yielded a cost savings will now be examined to determine the factors which permitted a cost reduction or elimination. The four comparisons which revealed greater savings by the GMC program will also be considered. But the two non-personnel positions will not be discussed in detail because they involve relatively small differences. Discussions of other comparisons revealing savings of less than $500 will also be brief.

Personnel

The combination of administrative and teaching responsibilities in one $7,800 position, provides the single greatest savings for the GMC program. Compared to the $18,000 cost of Crestmont's two positions--director and teacher--it is $10,200 lower. The GMC director/teacher can manage both jobs, partially because members of the church Board of Directors are responsible for all hiring and financial matters including budget planning and payroll. Both of these responsibilities are assumed by most directors of federally funded programs in Montgomery County. In addition, the program does not hold monthly evening parents' advisory board meetings or monthly staff training sessions, both requiring a substantial amount of the director's time. Shirley Finley, GMC's director/teacher, also feels that her attitude toward her work is largely responsible for allowing both jobs to be handled by one person.

However the County Day Care Coordinator, although he feels that the operation of a 30-child center cannot be justified under any circumstances, believes that the factor mentioned above, related to church assistance, to a greater extent explain how the GMC program can operate without a full-time director.

The assistance of the church also largely explains why a secretary/bookkeeper is not needed and why maintenance costs are so low. The former situation is possible because the treasurer of the church handles all bookkeeping responsibilities and frees the director to manage only the secretarial work which is light. The latter situation is possible because the church pays for maintenance service--cleaning and repairs--and the day care program's expenses are limited to hiring a high school student to set up and remove chairs in the classroom area for Sunday school.

The comparison of the salaries of the teacher aides must be qualified to show that GMC's costs are only moderately higher. For both classes at GMC, the two teacher aide pairs work a 52½-hour and a 40-hour week respectively. At Crestmont, both full-time teacher aides work a 40-hour week. The hourly wage of the GMC 4-5 year-old class teacher aides averages $2.75/hr. and the hourly wage of both 3 year-old class teacher aides is $2.50. Based on a 40 hour week, assuming both teacher aides pairs would divide the 40 hours in half, the GMC program would pay a combined salary of $5,720 to the 4-5 class aides and $5,200 to the 3 class aides. Thus the actual yearly difference in salaries is $720 and $200 respectively. Because this study is primarily interested in lower private costs, it will not attempt to explain why private salaries in this instance are higher. It will simply note the difference.

A similar situation occurs in reverse, comparing the salaries of the cooks. Both are paid an hourly wage of $2.50. However the GMC cook only works 17½ hours. Thus there would be no difference if both worked the same amount of time.

There are too many tangible and intangible factors which must be considered to explain the $240 a year difference in salaries of the Assistant Director/Teacher and the Teacher (3). Furthermore, this researcher does not feel qualified to determine appropriate salary levels. The study will simply note the difference.

The staffing pattern at GMC provides two adults at all times in the classrooms. Since both classrooms have 15 children, each group has a 7½ to 1 child-adult ratio. Privately funded programs are not required to met 5-to-1, 7-to-one regulations, therefore the present number of teachers is sufficient. If regulations had to be met, GMC would be required to hire another full-time teacher or two part-time teachers for the 3 year-old children's class--thereby eliminating most, or all of the $6,800 saved in not having a roving teacher.

The considerable difference in the number of hours worked by the GMC social worker is explained by several factors. First, the intake procedure does not require

him to make a time-consuming income determination review for every program applicant. And because there is no parents' advisory board, he is not required to prepare for monthly meetings. Second, because the majority of the children come from middle income families, and none are from poverty level families, there are fewer problems for the social worker to treat. For example, all the children enrolled at GMC receive adequate medical care, a proper diet, and live in decent housing.[1] Therefore there is no need for the social worker to devote time to health and housing problems--problems which federal program social workers often spend much time considering.

The problems which do exist however, such as speech defects or overly protective home environments, and staff training and classroom observation time needed, require more than five hours a week. According to Richard Morrison, GMC's social worker, a minimum of 8 to 12 hours a week is the "desireable" amount of time which should be spent visiting children's homes, observing classes, and meeting with staff, if he is to be effective. Presently, Mr. Morrison spends nearly all of his time visiting homes and subsequently has little time for the other responsibilities. Therefore, the higher level income of the clientele served largely explains the reduced hours of the GMC social worker.

Higher clientele income also explains why GMC does not need a bus driver. All of the parents work and own automobiles. They are capable of driving their children to the center and picking them up going to and from work. This situation contrasts with many federally funded programs which must provide transportation because so many parents do not own cars and must travel to their jobs by public transportation. Some federal programs however, may be able to lower their transportation costs by eliminating service to children living in walking distance of the center and to children who mothers can form carpools.

Fringe benefits (other than F.I.C.A.) are not paid to GMC staff because funds are not available. However even if they were, there are no regulations requiring that they be paid.

Substitute position costs are lower at GMC for two reasons: The hourly wage paid is $2.75, or .25/hr. less than the federal program rate, and staff are only

permitted 2½ paid sick days, compared to 10 days for federal program staff members. Once again, this study will merely state the differences because the researcher cannot properly evaluate personnel policies relating to salaries.

Social security taxes is the final line item comparison. The difference between the two amounts is the result of all the factors mentioned above which determined how many staff members were required for each program and how much they were paid.

For convenience, the factors which permitted GMC to save money in personnel costs can be categorized as follows: (Examples included)

1. Not required to meet state or federal regulations--Allowing a 7½-1 child-adult ratio in the 3 year-old children's class permits the teaching staff to be lowered by one, compared to the federal programs.
2. Church members willing to assume program responsibilities or pay for them--Maintenance costs are very low because the church pays for cleaning and repairs and the program only pays for a student to set up and remove chairs for Sunday school.
3. Fewer needs of middle income clientele require less services or less staff time--The social worker, who presently spends five hours a week working, feels that 8 to 12 hours a week would be an acceptable minimum amount of time providing service.
4. Miscellaneous or combination of factors--F.I.C.A. costs are higher because the staff, due to many factors, is smaller at GMC than at Crestmont.

There four categories will be used to explain lower or eliminated costs in the remaining line item comparisons. Two additional categories will also be used where appropriate:

5. More efficient program operation--There are no examples from personnel cost comparisons. However an example might be a significant savings in paper costs by using the back of computer print-outs obtained at no cost, from a local company.
6. No Actual Savings--When examined more closely, total costs had to be modified.

II Consumable Supplies

Food--According to the budget figures presented, GMC saved $3,000 compared to the Crestmont program's expenditures. However when both program's costs were more closely studied, several factors were revealed which showed that a total cost comparison was inaccurate and that Crestmont's daily cost-per-person served was the same as the GMC figure.

The Crestmont director determined that actual food expenditures for the year only totalled $4,932[1]. However included in this amount were purchases of food for a five-month breakfast program for 30 children. The Montgomery County Day Care Coordinator estimated that the cost of one breakfast is between .20 and .25. Using .225 as an average cost figure, the total cost of the breakfast program can be computed as follows: .225 x 30 children/day x 5 days/wk x 4 weeks/mo x 5 mo. or $6.75/day x 5 x 4 x 5 = $675.00. Since the GMC food costs did not include serving breakfasts, the total breakfast cost can be subtracted from $4,932 to make the comparison of total costs equitable. Thus, the total Crestmont food cost to be evaluated is $4,257.00.

A second factor must also be considered. The Crestmont cook prepares a meal for 40 people every day because nine staff members and one guest[2] eat lunch with the 30 children. This is in contrast to the GMC program,where a meal for 30 children and only five staff members is prepared every day. Since the total food costs include a different number of people served, they cannot be compared. Instead, they must be divided by the number of days food is served and divided again by the appropriate number of people, to derive a yearly cost-per-person served figure--which will be the proper figure to compare between the two programs.

Dividing Crestmont's adjusted total food cost--$4,257--by 250 days equals 17.028 or 17.03 a day. Dividing this figure by 40 gives the daily cost per person served--.425 or $.43 per day.

When GMC's total cost figure was examined more closely, it had to be re-evaluated

upward. First, it was learned that during the year the program receives approximately $480 worth of food from United States Government Surplus supplies. The GMC director estimated the total amount by estimating the value of one month's supply to be $40 and multiplying that figure by twelve. Since Crestmont does not receive government surplus, the $480 must be added to GMC's total, to give $3,480.

The revised total is subject to an additional increment. The $3,000 total food cost is a budgeted figure based on early 1974 monthly food bills of approximately $250 a month. However at that time, only 27 children were actually enrolled in the program. If 30 children are to be fed daily, then approximately $300 must be added to the adjusted total.[1] The additional amount was determined by using .40/day/person and multiplying by three. The cost of feeding for one day--$1.20--was then multiplied by 250 days to give $300. Therefore, the final adjusted total food cost for GMC is $3,780.

As mentioned earlier, the GMC program serves lunch to 35 people. To find the daily cost-per-person, the total cost--$3,780--is divided by 250 days to give the total cost per day--$15.12. That total is divided by 35 to yield .432 or $.43 per day--the same as the Crestmont figure. Therefore this comparison belongs in category 6

It can be argued that the analysis is subject to estimates and that actual costs and budgeted costs cannot be compared accurately and therefore the comparison has little value. Furthermore, it can be said that time periods are not the same--Crestmont's costs were incurred in fiscal year 1974 and GMC's costs were incurred in calendar year 1974--and therefore GMC will pay inflated prices for the period July through December 1974, relative to Crestmont's 1973 costs. However the purpose of the analysis was to show that GMC did not save $3,000 because of greater efficiencie and for that purpose, the comparison is valid.

Until actual costs can be determined for the GMC program, the comparison method used in this section must be considered acceptable.

Office Supplies--It is extremely difficult to evaluate cost differences because each program included different expenditures in this category. For example, postage costs are included in the GMC total but not in the Crestmont total. Because it appears that GMC spent more money, this study will not evaluate this category further.

Program Supplies--A comparison of costs in this category is equally difficult because "program supplies" can be defined in several ways. However in general, these are toys, table games, paper, crayons, and crafts materials.

Many factors, such as price, quantity purchased, and type of items purchased would determine the total costs. Therefore an explanation of the cost difference can only be a hypothesis and would be placed in category four mentioned above. Based on personal visits to both centers, this researcher believes that the Crestmont Center provides more supplies for children, and therefore its costs may be slightly higher. This statement does not imply that GMC's supplies are inadequate or that Crestmont's are over-abundant. It merely provides a possible explanation for the cost difference.

III Equipment

Equipment costs include outdoor play equipment and indoor heavy equipment such as storage cabinets, cubbies, and kitchen equipment. Assuming that GMC spends the amount of money allocated in the 1974 budget, it will spend slightly more than the Crestmont program. However if unanticipated expenses should arise, GMC would pay for them with funds allocated to this category, possibly lowering the total to an amount below Crestmont's figure. With further information this category cannot be evaluated.

IV Space

Rent and Utilities--The GMC program saves $3,800 a year in this category because the church does not charge rent for the use of the basement. The program only pays for utilities, at a cost of $1,000 a year. The savings can be easily explained by the church Board of Directors' willingness to forgo the extra income that would have been derived from the rent. This situation is an example of category two savings.

V Travel

Field Trips--Presently, field trips are not part of the GMC program because sufficient funds are not available. The director and the social worker expressed a desire to provide trips in the future, citing the educational benefits derived from exposing children to new experiences. Both agreed that not offering trips did not impair the program's effectiveness because all of the children, to vary degrees, visit new places with their families.

Bus Mileage--GMC does not incur mileage costs because it does not provide field trips or transportation. Neither service is offered because clientele needs for them are not critical. This cost elimination is a category three situation.

Staff Travel--As budgeted, GMC costs are greater than Crestmont's. In both cases, the expenses are incurred largely by the director and one other staff member--either the cook or the social worker. This study will not consider the comparison further because GMC did not save money and because factors affecting costs will be highly dependent on conditions which cannot be generalized.

VI Contract and Consultation

Consultants--This is a category one situation. GMC does not incur any training consultant costs because it is not required to meet state or federal staff training regulations. The GMC social worker does meet with the teaching staff four times a year to discuss his observations of the children's home environment. However these meetings cannot be compared to the staff training sessions conducted by the federally funded programs;the GMC staff only receives instruction from one person and the federal program staff receive training from several consultants who discuss many topics.

Accountant--As explained on page 16, this is an unusual expenditure for a federal program and therefore the cost comparison is not particularly useful. Crestmont is the only federal program in Montgomery County which incurred this cost. Therefore it is misleading to state that GMC eliminated the expenditure for one reason or another

Rather than offer an explanation for the cost elimination, this study will treat the situation as a miscellaneous item which cannot be analyzed in a way which might help other federal programs to lower their costs.

Bus Payments--As explained in other line item comparisons, field trips and transportation are not provided because clientele needs do not require these services to be offered. This is a category three situation.

VII Other Costs

Telephone--GMC's costs are budgeted to be $150 lower than Crestmont's costs. However the study did not attempt to analyze the factors affecting this expenditure because it was felt there were too many detailed considerations to evaluate which could not be generalized and compared to other centers. Furthermore, any evaluation undertaken would be highly specific and have limited value. Therefore this expenditure was not reviewed and placed in category four.

Postage--It would be difficult to compare both costs because GMC pays for postage out of an office supplies account. For this reason and the reason stated above, postage costs were not evaluated and the expenditure was also placed in category four.

Insurance--All of GMC's insurance is included in the church's insurance policy at no cost to the program. This cost elimination should be included in category two

VIII Department of Public Welfare Costs

Because GMC is a private program and therefore is not administered by the state D.P.W., it does not have to pay 1/19 of total program cost for D.P.W. services. This is a category one situation.

A chart summarizing the cost comparison savings factors is presented on the following pages. It places every GMC cost savings or elimination in one of the six categories outlined on page 44. It also shows the amount saved or eliminated and the percentage of the total savings that each category represents. The summary will be a useful tool in answering the question raised in this section of the study--Are there any procedures used by lower cost private programs which can be adopted by federal programs?

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 4 - 5

Factors Which Permitted CMC to Save $42,770* in Operating Costs

Factor		Savings	% Total Savings
I	Church Members Willing to Assume Responsibilities or Pay for Services		
	1. Combined responsibilities-Director/Teacher	$10,200	
	2. No Secretary/Bookkeeper	3,300	
	3. Low maintenance costs	1,905	
	4. No accountant consultant	400[1]	
	5. No rent cost	3,800	
	6. No insurance cost	600	
		$20,205	42.7%
II	Not Required to Meet State or Federal Regulations		
	1. Both classes permitted 7½:1 child-adult ratios	6,800	
	2. No fringe benefits (other than F.I.C.A.)	586	
	3. No consultant costs	250	
	4. No D.P.W. Administrative cost	4,291	
		$11,927	25.1%
III	Less Critical Needs of Middle Class Clientele Require Fewer Services Provided		
	1. Social Worker's Hours Reduced	3,314	
	2. No Bus Driver	3,000	
	3. No bus	2,004	
	4. No field trips	200	
	5. No bus mileage	496	
		$9,014	19.1%

Factor	Savings	% Total Savings
IV Miscellaneous/Unevaluated		
1. Lower salary--Teacher (3)	240	
2. Lower salary--Cook	325	
3. F.I.C.A. savings	1,510	
4. Substitute position costs reduced	700	
5. Program supplies costs lower	160	
6. Telephone/Postage costs lower	254	
	$3,189	6.8%
V No Actual Savings		
1. Food costs same on per-person basis	3,000	6.3%
VI More Efficient Program Operation		
No savings	--	
Gross Savings	$47,335	100.0%
CMC Costs Greater Than Crestmont		
1. Four part-time Teacher-Aide salaries	$3,975	
2. Office Supplies	350	
3. Equipment	90	
4. Staff Travel	150	
	$4,565	
Gross Savings	$47,335	
	- 4,565	
Net Savings	$42,770	

---

* Net Savings

1 Crestmont is the only Title IV-A program in Montgomery County receiving such service

A review of the data presented in the chart indicates the following:

1. 31.4% of GMC's gross savings, or almost one-third, can be eliminated immediately as possible means of cost reduction for federally funded programs.

Category two (25.1%) includes all items which are not state or federally regulated. The only way these savings techniques could be applied to federal programs would be through a lowering of existing regulations. This study has defined "quality day care" in terms of those regulations and has stated that no recommendations which would lower quality would be considered. Therefore all items in category two can be eliminated as possible ways to lower costs.

Category five (6.3%) only contains one item. Under closer examination, it was determined that food costs at the two centers, as best as could be determined at this time, were the same. Therefore there is no savings method to consider.

2. 19.1% of GMC's savings*, or nearly one-fifth, is possible because the less critical needs of the middle class clientele served require that fewer services be provided than at federal centers.

Category three contains all items as described above. All, with the exception of the social worker, are transportation-related and not required by regulations. Theoretically, they could be sources of cost reduction. In fact, some federally funded centers such as Crestmont and Ambler have reduced these costs. However in the programs where these costs continue to rise each year, it is important to remember what most represent--services satisfying critical, low income needs, which if not provided would mean that many children could not be brought to the center. Federal program administrators have a responsibility to insure that all childrn who live in walking distance, walk to the center and all parents who own cars and can form carpools do so. If these steps are taken, no one can fairly criticize a federal program for providing transportation services by pointing to the private programs which do not. No comparison can be made because the needs of each group are different.

52

* gross savings

3. 42.7% of GMC's gross savings, or the largest single amount, is due to church members who are willing to assume program responsibilities or pay for services.

Category one includes all of these items. With the exception of the salary of the Director/Teacher, all of the savings are possible entirely because of church support. With the exception of the first item, all would be acceptable means of savings for federal program administrators. However since church-affiliated activities cannot receive funds from the federal government, other non-profit organizations who would agree to offer services on a volunteer basis, will have to be found to effectuate the cost reductions outlined.

It is unrealistic to expect an outside group to pay for insurance or maintenance. However some organizations may agree to rent space at nominal costs or for the cost of utilities and may have members willing to provide free financial assistance.

The North Hills Day Care program is an excellent example of how outside organization support can lower some of these costs. The North Hills Community Center permits the day care program to operate in its building and only requires payment of utilities--$100 a month. The total utilities cost for the year--$1,200--is $3,600 less than Creatmont's yearly rent and utilities cost--a significant saving.

According to Meade Breese, the Montgomery County Day Care Coordinator, day care administrators have not made enough of any effort to involve non-profit organizations in the support of their programs. He stated that greater community participation is one of the few ways that day care costs--especially rental costs--can be lowered realistically.

4. 6.8% of GMC's gross savings could not be evaluated because of insufficient information or were explained by several miscellaneous factors.

Category five includes all of these items. Either there was too much or too little information available to consider the savings in this category. The researcher is not qualified to evaluate salaries and did not have enough information to compare

program supply costs. Telephone costs, on the other hand, were not considered because there were too many highly detailed factors to analyze. F.I.C.A. costs, although not examined separately, were explained by the factors which account for a larger federal program staff.

5. None of GHC's savings were made possible by more efficient operation.

There are no procedures used at GHC which might be comparable to the example of efficiency given on page 44.

There are two conclusions which can be drawn from the finding of the federal-private cost comparison:

1. It is unfair to criticize federally-funded day care programs for excessive spending, by pointing to the lower costs of comparable private programs. A valid comparison cannot be made because the two programs differ in two key respects--regulations and clientele--which permit the private programs to spend considerably less.

Private programs are not subject to federal or state regulations and therefore can spend much less for personnel and administrative costs than federal programs. And since the less critical needs of the middle class clientele of private programs permit a reduction in services provided, additional money can be saved. These two factors permitted the GHC program to save over $20,000 compared to the Crestmont program and they account for nearly 50% of the difference in total costs. However as long as regulations are unchanged and as long as the clientele groups served by each program remain the same, the cost of federally-funded day care programs will be significantly higher than the cost of comparable privately-funded programs.

2. Private program costs, in many cases, are also lower than federal program costs because the programs are church-related and board members are willing to assume important responsibilities or the church will pay for services. Federal programs could duplicate this practice and lower their costs by seeking greater support from outside, non-profit organizations (non church-related).

The GMC program, which is one of nearly 30 church-related day care programs in Montgomery County, saved more than $20,000 compared to the Crestmont program because church board members provided valuable administrative assistance and the church paid for certain services. Federal programs cannot, of course, become church-related, however they can involve non-profit organizations in the support of their programs. The savings resulting from greater outside participation would vary from center to center, but lower rent costs is a significant cost reduction which could result.[1]

The second conclusion answers the question--"Can any private practices be adopted by federal programs to help reduce costs?" Together with the suggestions obtained in the interviews with the five administrators, the second conclusion brings this study slightly closer to answering the larger question "Are there ways to reduce the cost of federally- funded day care programs, while maintaining quality?"

There is a third and final approach to this question which will now be considered. The lower costs of providing care in day care homes, rather than centers, will be discussed to determine exactly how much savings is possible and to what extent the day care home concept might be expanded.

III Cost Reduction--Three Approaches

C. Home Day Care

Home day care, stated in the simplest terms, is day care service provided to children in the private homes of women or men. Programs serving up to six children are called family home care and programs operating in expanded facilities, serving up to twelve children, are called group home care. Because federally-funded group home care does not exist in Montgomery County, this study will only examine the costs of family homes. Before looking in detail at the budget of a home program, the study will explain briefly how family homes are administered.

Federally-funded day care homes were first established in Montgomery County in 1973. The County Day Care Coordinator's office was authorized by the state D.P.W. to use approximately $144,000 out of the $1,161,071 fiscal year 1974 budget to set up 15 homes. As of May 1974, 14 have been established and the fifteenth is expected to be in operation by the end of June.

The Day Care Coordinator's office has assumed total responsibility for development of the family home care program. Administrative responsibilities have included selection of home care mothers, supervision of the intake of children, development of program curricula and coordination of in-service training programs provided to home care mothers.

The women hired for the position of home day care mother are required to meet certain minimum qualifications. They must maintain a large enough home to accomodate
1
six children and it must be free of any fire or safety hazzards. They must also demonstrate an understanding of young children and problems particular to them. And they are required to serve meals which meet the same federal and state regulations which apply to day care centers. All potential home sites and home care mothers are visited by a member of the coordinator's office before a final decision is made.

The children selected for the day care homes are admitted according to Pennsylvania D.P.W. regulations. As mentioned before, a maximum of six children

can be accommodated in each home(five, in Montgomery County). However unlike the day care centers, children between the ages of two months and five years will be permitted to enroll in the programs. And when space permits, these same homes can accommodate children between the ages of five and ten years-old for after school activities. The wide range in ages is possible because the small size of the group permits the day care mothers to give individual attention to each child.

Home day care activities have been patterned in general, after the activities of day care centers. Mornings are divided into periods for quiet free play; group discussion and learning; snack time; and outside play. At noon a hot lunch is provided followed by a rest period which may be from one and one half hours to two hours long. The afternoon includes a free play period; snack time; and quiet play. But this schedule is not adherred to rigidly and is used more as a guideline.

Approximately 15 days of in-service training are provided to all day care mothers hired for the family programs. Usually conducted on a monthly basis, the training sessions are held for the day care mothers as a group. Topics of discussion have included meal planning, child health, psychological development and daily program planning. All of the sessions are planned by the Day Care Coordinator's office.

In addition, to the training sessions, the Social Worker/Coordinator from the County Day Care office stays in contact with all of the day care mothers on a regular basis.

In summary, the family day care homes, although a separate part of the Title IV-A day care system in Montgomery County, are subject to federal and state regulations, and are carefully monitored by the staff of the County Day Care office. The level of quality care expected from the home programs is the same as what is expected from the center programs.

Because the funds for day care homes come out of the Day Care Administrator's office section of the Title IV-A total budget, the budget for one day care home

must be extrapolated from line item total amounts. Therefore, salaries where appropriate, are divided by 15--the total number of homes--in order to include administrative costs in the total one-home personnel cost. The following home care budget was developed with the assistance of the Montgomery County Day Care Coordinator.

One Family Day Care Home Budget--Fiscal Year 1974

Category	Amount	% of Total
I Personnel		
1 Family Day Care Mother	$5,375	
1/15 Family Day Care Social Worker/Coordinator ($10,550/15)	704	
1/15 Family Day Care Social Worker/Coordinator Aide ($7,500/15)	500	
1 Substitute Position (2.10/hr x 8hrs/day x 20 days)	336	
Fringe Benefits		
F.I.C.A. (5.85% x total personnel costs-$6,915)	405	
Retirement Fund (1.5% total personnel costs)	99	
Hospitalization ($8.00/mo/person x 12mo. x 1 2/15)	109	
	$7,528	78.5%
II Consumable Supplies		
Food (.65/day/person x 6 people x 250 days)	975	
Program Supplies (consumables)	30	
	$1,005	10.4%
III Department of Public Welfare Costs		
1/19 total program cost--$9,106	480	5.1%
IV Travel		
Emergency Travel ($4/wk x 50 weeks)	200	
Staff Travel (100mi./wk x 50wks x 2/15 x .12/mi)	80	
	$280	2.9%

58

Category	Amount	% of Total
V Equipment		
Heavy play equipment (non-consumable)	$200	
Repair costs ($10/mo./center x 12mos./15 centers	8	
	$208	2.2%
VI Contract and Consultation		
15 consultants for approx. 15 training sessions (15 x $50 /15 = $750/15)	$50	
one child per home not eligible for D.P.W. medical assistance--expenses paid by Title IV-A [1]	20	
	$ 70	.7%
VII Other Expenses		
Telephone, Postage, Insurance estimated at $225 for 15 homes/15	$15	.2%
VIII Space		
No rent--programs operate in private homes	0	0 %
Total	$9,586	100.0%
Yearly cost-per-child [2]	$1,917	

Examining the cost of providing family home day care shows that this type of program can significantly reduce the cost of providing center care. Compared to the $2,860 yearly cost-per-child figure established for the Crestmont Center, the family day care home cost-per-child--$1,917--is $843 lower. When that figure is multiplied by 30 children, a sizeable savings is realized. Six family day care homes could provide care to 30 children for $57,510, compared to the Crestmont program which provides care for $85,811. The family home system could save a total of $28,301.

Lower costs are possible largely because smaller enrollment in the family programs permits certain major expenditures to be eliminated: director, social worker, cook, bus driver, secretary/bookkeeper, maintenance, and rent. These reductions and most of the others which explain cost differences, cannot be adopted by center programs because of their much larger size. Therefore there is no reason to compare [illegible]d center budgets on a line item basis to determine whether cost reduction procedures from the former can be applied to the latter--it is obvious that in most cases they cannot. Instead, it must be asked to what extent future day care funds should continue to be used to set up higher-cost day care centers rather than family homes. That is, when new funds become available for expansion, should family day care homes be established exclusively, in order to provide care to more children?

Because of the subjective nature of the question, this study has only undertaken a limited discussion of the issue. The County Day Care Coordinator was asked to explain the basic differences between centers and homes and offer a recommendation for the proper use of future funds. To provide additional, and possibly conflicting information, the Executive Director of the Day Care Association of Montgomery County was also asked to comment on the question.

Meade Breese, the County Coordinator, explained that center programs are designed to operate much like schools. Because of their size, usually 30 or more children, centers offer a structured program. The day is divided into several

activity periods. He noted that there is little difference between a center day care program and public school kindergarten except for the length of the day.

In contrast, home care is designed to approximate a family situation. The program is not as structured as the center because the smaller-sized group of children allows the day care mother to gear activities to the daily needs of each child. For example, the ages of the children in a day care home can vary from infant to school age and different feeding and rest periods are required and easily arranged. One visit to a family home therefore, does not reveal a "schedule." Several days of observation are required before a program pattern begins to emerge.

Both programs serve as a place for a child to be cared for while the parent is working. However each one provides a completely different environment which satisfies the needs of two distinct types of children.

The center will satisfy the needs of a pre-school child who has been exposed to members of his peer group and has learned how to interact successfully with other children before entering the program. The large group setting will offer a new situation that the child should be able to adapt to without serious difficulties.

The family day care home, on the other hand, is better suited to the special needs of a child who has not interacted with other children and has spent most of his first three years in the immediate family setting. This type of child does not know how to relate to other children and might feel threatened by the sudden exposure to his peer group. The transition from the child's home to a day care center could prove to be too great and cause the child to withdraw from all activities. The day care home however, presents a less dramatic change of environment--it is another family rather than a school setting. The child will be given the opportunity to relate to children on a limited basis--a much less threatening experience than encountering a large group. Furthermore, the day care home can also accommodate infants, toddlers, and school age children simultaneously, while the center usually can only serve pre-school children.

Because the two programs satisfy distinct needs, Mr. Breese feels that they cannot be compared to judge one superior to the other.

"To create a truly comprehensive day care system, where children with different and changing needs can receive appropriate care, both centers and homes must be developed," he said. "However in rural areas where children are geographically scattered, the family day care home is the better program because it eliminates the considerable expense of providing rural transportation."

Mr. Breese concluded that future day care expansion funds should be spent to establish more homes and more centers despite the lower operating costs of the homes.

Ruth Mayden, Executive Director of DCAMC, agreed that the two programs satisfy distinct needs. However she felt that they could be compared and that the center programs provide a better educational experience for children.

She noted three differences between the two types of programs: 1. Day care homes are not monitored on a daily basis and certain problems can occur. 2. Day care home activities are not run by trained teachers. 3. Children in day care homes are not exposed to as many children as in a center and consequently their experiences are not as varied.

The first difference was considered most significant. Based on discussions with administrators outside of Montgomery County who have had experience with day care homes, Ms. Mayden detailed some of the abuses which have taken place because of insufficient monitoring. She cited instances of day care mothers remaining in bed part of the day, allowing one of their children to supervise the children's activities Others have watched television for several hours and invited neighbors over to socialize.

However, despite her criticism, Ms. Mayden supports the home day care concept and would like to see both centers and homes expanded. "For children with special needs,"she concluded,"the day care home is probably the better vehicle for providing care."

In summary, both administrators have observed that center programs and home programs satisfy distinct needs and they agree that both programs are needed to establish a comprehensive day care system. And since both administrators are opposed to discontinuing day care center expansion in favor of greater home expansion, cost savings are not likely to be realized in this manner.

IV Conclusion

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

1. There is a tremendous need for quality day care in the United States which is not being satisfied by existing programs.

2. The Federal government, looked to as the major source of funding, most likely will not provide nearly enough money to satisfy the need.

3. Recognizing present funding limitations forces one to ask the following question: Are there ways to reduce the cost of federally-funded day care programs, while maintaining quality, and thereby allow future federal funds to serve a greater number of children? (Quality is defined according to the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements of September 23, 1968 and the Pennsylvania Title 4600 Regulations of June 1969.)

4. A detailed examination of the Crestmont Day Care Center, a 30-child program in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, showed that the yearly cost of providing day care for one child is $2,860. The County Day Care office verified this figure as the average cost for all Title IV-A-funded programs for fiscal year 1974. This amount, used as a base figure for the entire study, could potentially be reduced.

The examination of the Crestmont budget also indicated that nearly 80% of day care center expenditures are mandated by federal and state regulations.

5. Five Montgomery County day care administrators, asked to suggest cost reduction methods, made four recommendations:

a. Transportation services could be reduced or discontinued at some centers with no decline in attendance or program quality. (The Ambler Day Care Center, which discontinued service in February, 1974, will be able to save $2,540 yearly.)

b. Rental costs might be lowered by establishing federal day care center rent ceiling regulations--maximum cost-per-square-foot guidelines for different facilitie

c. Consultant costs could be lowered at all centers by replacing individual center training sessions with group conferences set up by County day care coordinators and by utilizing existing free workshops to a greater extent. (If the nine Title IV-A centers in Montgomery County held only group training sessions, they could save $1,225 yearly.)

d. Total costs could be reduced if programs could relocate to larger facilities and increase enrollment. (The yearly cost-per-child declines $126 when a center of 25 children is increased to 50 children.)

The total savings resulting from the four suggestions was $9,245--enough to provide day care to three more children for one year.

6. The budget of a lower-cost, privately-funded day care program, the Grace Mennonite Church Child Day Care Center, Lansdale, Pennsylvania, was compared to the Crestmont budget, to determine if any private operating procedures could be adopted by federally-funded programs.

a. A detailed examination of the GMC budget indicated that full-day, year-round day care can be provided to 30 children at a yearly cost-per-child of $1,434 (total cost $43,041) or one-half the cost of the Crestmont program.

b. Almost 50% of the cost difference was possible because private programs are not subject to federal regulations or the same state regulations. Private programs also serve the less critical needs of a middle income clientele and fewer services are required.

c. Slightly more than 50% of the cost difference was possible because the private program is church-related and church members are willing to assume important program responsibilities. Federal programs could lower their costs by seeking greater support from outside non-profit organizations (non-church-related). (The North Hills Day Care Center saves several thousand dollars every year in rent costs with the assistance of the North Hills Community Center.)

7. Home day care programs, day care services in the private homes of women and men, can be provided at a yearly cost-per-child of $1,917 or two-thirds the cost of the Crestmont Center program.

However leading day care administrators in Montgomery County are opposed to discontinuing day care center expansion in favor of greater home expansion, because each program satisfies distinct child needs and therefore both are needed to establish a comprehensive day care delivery system.

Footnotes

Page

1 1 A Report Based on Findings of The National Council of Jewish Women--Windows on Day Care, Keyserling, Mary D., National Council of Jewish Women, 1972

2 200,000 children to receive full-day service and 200,000 to receive part-day service--half of each group to receive full subsidies and half to receive partial subsidies

3 Acting Director, Division of Financial Analysis, Community Services Administration, Department of Health Education and Welfare

2 1 summarized by researcher from Federal and State regulation handbooks

2 includes immunizations

5 1 explained in detail on page 7

2 actual enrollment is 50; 100 is capacity

3 actual enrollment is 35; 75 is capacity

6 1 Community Day Care Program, Crestmont Center, Jenkintown Day Nursery (7 childrer North Hills Day Care Center

7 1 made possible by payment from Montgomery County Commissioners

2 small advance payment made, but invoices submitted at end of month

10 1 actual cost is $4,932

2 all children eligible for D.P.W. medical assistance--no medical costs incurred

3 no consultant costs were incurred--funds used for other expenditures

4 new bus required approximately every five years

a

Page

11 1
for remaining 7 trips, staff must be admitted at no charge or pay with own funds

2
Director stated that attendance averages 27 out of 30 children,or 90%, on a steady basis

12 1
Phyllis Borland, Director North Hills program; Karen Perrott, Director Main Line Child Day Care Center

13 1
pp. 6,7 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, September 23, 1968 (FIDCR)
p. 6 Title 4600 Regulations

2
p. 10 FIDCR
p. 9 Title 4600

14 1
p. 8 Title 4600

2
p. 9 Title 4600

3
p. 14 Title 4600

15 1
p. 9 Title 4600

2
p. 5 Title 4600

3
p. ibid.

4
p.$46,679 + 5.85% of this total = $49,409

5
salary of the Director

16 1
p. 10 FIDCR
p. 13 Title 4600

2
p. 9 FIDCR

17 2
It is not possible to decermine these expenditures.

1
p. 13 FIDCR
p. 5 Title 4600 b

Page

18 1
p. 12 Title 4600

19 1
The salaries of the two Crestmont teachers--$8,000 and $7,000,average out to be $7,500. The starting salary for a kindergarten teacher in the Norristown Area School District, which is competitive with all other Montgomery County school districts, is $7,850. Yearly increments of $450 are given. Since the two Crestmont teachers started in October 1972, they would be receiving $8,300 in the public schools from October 1973 -- October 1974.

25 1
2 miles each trip x 2 trips/day = 4 mi/day x 5 days/wk x 4 wks/mo. = 80mi./mo.

27 1
$11[illegible] consumable items included

28 1
To prevent programs from finding facilities, a special exception clause should be included, allowing higher rents in some instances.

29 1
according to Karen Perrott

2
Cost and Quality Issues for (Day Care) Operators, Abt Associates, Inc., 1972, p. 63 "The decline in cost per child from $2349 in (a center of) average daily attendance of 25, to $2223, a savings of $126 per child, is attributable to declines in the per-child costs of certain personnel..."

32 1
Topics included: Speech and Hearing Disorders; Language Development; Exceptional Children; Psychological Problems of Children

2
County Coordinator's estimate

3
fees range between $50 and $100

33 1
several costs would be lowered and total cost would drop

35 1
ages of children affect child-adult staffing requirements which can raise personnel costs

36 *
The 1974 budget was developed for a 35-child program. Presently only 27 children are enrolled and the figures will probably be modified for a 30-child prgram. The researcher asked David Hersh, Chairman of the Board at GMC to work out the modified budget--it is presented in the study.

1
10:30 a.m.--5:30 p.m. 3.00/hr. x 35hrs/wk.x 52 wks

c

Page

36 2
Teacher Aide 6:30 a.m.--10:00 a.m./Cook 10:00 a.m.--1:30 p.m.
$2.50/hr x 35hrs/wk x 52 wks

37 1
expansion year--atypical costs, average is $800

38 1
reimbusement up to .55/day per child

43 1
according to Richard Morrison, GMC's Social Worker, who has visited the homes of all children enrolled in the program

45 1
based on receipts for 11 months plus the average of them

2
typical guests might include a member of the Parents' Advisory Committee or a staff member of the County Coordinator's Office

46 1
Presently, 27 children and 5 staff--32 people--require $3,480 in food. Dividing by 32 gives the total cost per day--$13.23. Dividing by 32 gives the present cost per person--.41. With 35 this figure would be slightly less, therefore .40 was used as an approximation.

55 1
The North Hills Day Care Center is an example of lower rent costs resulting from cooperation with a non-profit organization.

56 1
Title 4700 State regulations set six children as a maximum. In Montgomery County five is the maximum.

58 1
If a day care mother must take a child to the hospital and does not have a car, this provides taxi money and money to pay someone to watch the children.

59 1
County Day Care Coordinator's estimate

2
will be lower in fiscal year 1975--program will expand to 21 homes and staff in day care office will remain the same

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you very much, Congressman. Now, I will turn my gavel over to Senator Stafford.

[Senator Stafford assumed the Chair.]

Senator STAFFORD. While I am changing seats, if the panel of religious organizations will come forward.

Ladies and gentlemen, this subcommittee understands that members of the panel of religious organizations who are here are Monsignor Reese, Dr. Baker, Ruth Gilbert and William Tremitiere.

We understand that Senator Schweiker, while he was presiding, suggested that your full statements go in the record as printed and that you summarize your statements as you may wish, in view of the number of witnesses, hopefully within something like 5 minutes.

With that preliminary remark, and hoping that the Congresslady with me will agree, we will invite you to proceed in whatever order you might wish.

Monsignor REESE. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MSGR. THOMAS J. REESE, SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL CONCERNS AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CATHOLIC SOCIAL SERVICES OF THE DIOCESE OF WILMINGTON, DEL., REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. JOHN W. BAKER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS; RUTH GILBERT, SECRETARY FOR COMMUNITY ACTION, SECRETARIAT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS, WOMEN'S DIVISION OF THE BOARD OF GLOBAL MINISTRIES, UNITED METHODIST CHURCH; AND WILLIAM C. TREMITIERE, MANAGER OF CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS, TRESSLER-LUTHERAN SERVICE ASSOCIATES, A PANEL

Monsignor REESE. I am Monsignor Thomas J. Reese, secretary of the Department of Social Concerns and executive director of Catholic Social Services of the Diocese of Wilmington. I have had 20 years of experience in administering social service programs to families and children.

Today, I am representing the National Conference of Catholic Charities, which serves some 1,500 member agencies and institutions throughout the United States.

The Catholic charities network, with a combined local community budget of nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars a year, serves millions of families in the United States. It represents the largest nongovernmental program in the field of social services.

Since its founding in 1910, it has been committed to providing services and supporting public social policy which would strengthen the fabric of family life in our country.

We are convinced that the general welfare of the Nation depends on the welfare and strength of its families.

We are pleased that these distinguished congressional subcommittees have called these hearings to explore the impact of governmental policy and program on families and children and welcome this opportunity to

testify in support of S. 626 and H.R. 2966. Although substantially the same, there are some differences in the bills. In general, we favor the Senate version.

Specifically, while we recognize the importance of training of personnel for child care, we think this can be done on an ongoing basis and that a year, such as suggested in the House bill, is not necessary to be devoted to training before moving strongly into program.

Furthermore, there are already trained people who could be utilized immediately to begin programs.

We think the legislation should be clearer as to the inclusion of profit-making services. In our opinion, they should not be included because there is ample evidence that they frequently cut corners and provide poor quality service.

The kinds of prime sponsors for the services is important and should be sufficiently flexible so as not to exclude some of the more logical providers, such as school systems, both public and parochial.

Good day care standards are important, otherwise the programs could end up simply warehousing children and not providing them with the services needed for the proper development. We think it is important that the standards be consistent with those adopted in 1968. We are concerned that legislation incorporated into title XX of the social security amendments permits relaxed standards that could be detrimental to children.

As to fee schedule, the Senate bill seems more generous and realistic since it provides some ongoing support as family income rises above the poverty line and attempts to avoid the notching effect that would prove a deterrent to some families from increasing their income.

We urge the inclusion in the bill of a definition such as that incorporated in title XX providing eligibility for day care services to families below 80 percent of the median income in their State with graduated fee scales as the income increases.

Recognition of the necessity for parental involvement is serving on policy and planning committees with some opportunity for parent education and consultation. This seems hardly adequate.

Unless the parent progresses as the child does, much of the improvement in the child will be eroded by parental inadequacy.

We suggest that consideration be given to strengthening the social service component so the parents could receive more service and support. At the very least, an information and referral service should be available to them to assure that any community resources that they need are at their disposal.

Consideration might be given to development of contracts for professional service where family and marriage counseling is indicated.

Direct involvement of parents in various aspects of program operation will probably be more valuable than formal parent education programs since it will afford them an opportunity to learn by doing, and there is more likelihood that they will carry over their new learning into the context of their family living.

Despite the title of the bill, the focus is rather narrow viz, day care for children. Family emphasis is slight and consideration should be given to enhancing it.

Furthermore, major emphasis in the bill is on care of preschool children. This is sorely needed. However, there is a serious problem for

children of working mothers in the early school grades, children from 6 to 11. Often they are left without supervision or any kind of meaningful program.

It would be helpful if the bill gave more consideration to after-school programs that could provide necessary supervision for these children and help them to develop educationally and socially.

The need for quality day care programs, especially for working mothers, has been well documented. These bills will make a substantial contribution toward meeting the need.

Admittedly, the services provided for in these bills are expensive and we are in a period of economic difficulty when minimizing Government expense is desirable. Nevertheless, we, as a people, must not lose sight of our priorities.

Certainly the welfare of our children and the Nation's families are top priority which cannot be ignored in determining the use of the Nation's tax dollar. Failure to enact this legislation can result in incredible social, personal and financial costs in the future. Its enactment will make a significant contribution to the quality of life in the United States.

Thank you, sir.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Monsignor Reese, for an excellent and brief statement.

We will invite the next witness to be Dr. Baker, since you are listed next.

It is the subcommittee's intent to hear all four witnesses first, before going to questions. Dr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. I am John Baker. I am associate director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

We represent the eight major black and white Baptist denominations here in the country. While I always put this little caveat in, Baptists being what they are, that we do not purport to speak for any one Baptist, neither do we try to speak for all of them. They usually do fairly well on their own.

What I have done here, because we have made only general statements vis-a-vis the main contents of the bills themselves, is to voice a general support for such programs as these.

We do favor policy which is constructively child and family oriented, and we have tended to support those public programs which aid minority and needy children and families when the end result to be achieved by those programs are ethically, morally, and constitutionally sound.

I emphasize this point. We also are supportive of the idea that the Government has a strong affirmative role to play in social programs.

Some of our Baptists have only become accommodated, as I indicated in the testimony, to the idea that Government has such a role. I think most of them have come to the point of view that this is not only a necessary, but a desirable role for them to play.

For some of the reasons I have summarized, without going into detail, I think Monsignor Reese did an excellent job of summarizing the more technical details of the bills, and I do say that we find that H.R. 2966, which is the main document that we looked at, and its effort to secure adequate, constructive, convenient, and supportable child and family services has many merits. With some modifications we could urge its passage.

The serious reservations, and I think this essentially is our role on the Washington scene, deals with the problem of religious liberty and the separation of church and state.

I do not have in my written statement, Mrs. Chisholm, the idea that occurred to me here, as I have thought about the bill this morning and I may have overlooked it in the bill, but one of the things that does not deal with church-state issues that I have some reservations about has to do with continual use in the House bill of the terms "working mothers" and "single parents."

I wonder if there should not be some provision made for a mother who for her own reasons does not work. Should not her children be included in these proposed programs? I guess I am old fashioned but, even though my wife works, women who do not choose to work outside the home should not be forced to do so. Their children should not be denied these proposed services.

As the bill now stands, we do not see there are adequate protections in terms of religious liberty, both individually and corporate. This is not to say that the bill does not have some safeguards built into it. I have tried to bring these out.

Section 503, for example, does build in safeguards, and does clearly forbid discrimination on hiring on the general basis of sex does prescribe the use of creed and race in the selection of program participants, and applicants for participation, but it does not talk in terms of limiting discrimination with reference to hiring on the basis of religion.

There is, it seems to me, a real danger of entanglement of the church and state. If you look at section 203 and section 106(b) (17) and (18), you find that there is a provision for establishing an agency to continually monitor programs—I am here concerned with those that might be established in churches, not those established by secular groups. I think such supervision is necessary any time you have Federal funds going into a program. There has to be monitoring, but what bothers me is the extent to which Government may go in reviewing the internal workings of religious groups.

The pending legislation provides for evaluation, licensing, and inspection; physical inspection, funding, and accounting procedures; and the creation of an agency that is to constantly monitor both secular and religious groups.

The final objection, and then I will quit, is that if these shortcomings were cleared up, I would still have some hesitation in terms of the church's involvement in the operation and running of some of these programs. Baptist churches have gotten into some headstart and day care programs, and we think this is great, and encourage them in it.

When churches write and ask if there is a church-state issue involved in the taking of Federal or State money for headstart and day care, I tell them there is nothing inherently wrong with churches accepting public funds to support the programs. It depends on their motives.

If their motives are to enroll these kids and enlist them and evangelize them, apostolicize them, recruit them into the churches, then I think they are on the wrong foot.

If, on the other hand, they are seeking to perform a service to the community, to working mothers, to the children I see no problem. But I think the Congress must put in safeguards to prevent the use of public funds to achieve religious ends.

If a church operates one of these programs, its purpose should not be evangelization, proselytizing, et cetera. With proper safeguards we would support the bill, and we support strongly the thrust of the bills.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Dr. Baker.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Baker follows:]

Statement of John W. Baker
Associate Director
Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs

ON H.R. 2966 DEALING WITH SERVICES
TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Before a joint meeting of the
Select Subcommittee on Education of the
Committee on Education and Labor
United States House of Representatives
and the
Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
United States Senate

March 13, 1975

Chairman Brademas, Chairman Mondale and Members of the Subcommittees:

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs is composed of representatives appointed by eight cooperating Baptist conventions and conferences in the United States with a combined membership of more than 23 million. They are: American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.; Baptist General Conference; National Baptist Convention of America; National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.; North American Baptist General Conference; Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.; Seventh Day Baptist General Conference; and Southern Baptist Convention.

Historically Baptists have had profound concerns for religious liberty and for proper church-state relations. The responsibility of the Joint Committee has been to interpret these concerns to both government and the constituencies of our supporting member bodies.

Because of the democratic organization of individual Baptist churches and their conventions or conferences, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs does not purport to speak for any one Baptist or for all of them. However, the Baptist Joint Committee is authorized to represent to government its own and official denominational positions.

Baptist conventions and conferences and the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs generally have looked with favor on public policy which is constructively child and family oriented. They have tended to be supportive of those public programs which aid minority and needy children and families when the ends sought to be achieved by those programs are ethically, morally, and constitutionally sound.

We are also supportive of the concept that government has an affirmative role to play in finding solutions to pressing social problems. For example, no doubt some of the members of the House Subcommittee will recall the role which the Baptist Joint Committee played in the compromises which permitted programs of aid to children to be included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Many of the modern social services which are administered or funded in whole or in part by public agencies were once almost the exclusive responsibility of churches or other private associations. A few Baptists have only become accomodated to this shift but most of them accept an active governmental role as both necessary and desirable.

For these and other reasons we find that H.R. 2966, in its effort to secure adequate, constructive, convenient, and affordable child and family services, has many merits and, with some modifications, we could urge its passage. The serious reservations which we have center around traditional Baptist concerns for religious liberty and separation of church and state.

As the bill now stands, in our opinion adequate protection is not provided for individual

or corporate religious liberty.

For example, according to Sec.104(a) a state, locality, or combination of localities -- all public entities -- ". . . may be designated by e Secretary as a prime sponsor for the purpose of entering into arrangements to carry out programs . . . ." but in 104(e)(2) the Secretary is authorized to fund directly certain private nonprofit agencies which could include churches and/or their educational subsidiaries. Sec. 104(f) seeks to protect against discrimination against minority group children and economically disadvantaged children but no part of Sec. 104 assures that religious discrimination will not be tolerated.

This is not to say that there are no safeguards in the bill. Sec. 503(a) has a broad statement forbidding the Secretary to fund a program if those with responsibility for its operation discriminate with respect to a program participant or applicant for participation in such program " . . . because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation or beliefs." Sec. 503(b) prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex for either participation in a program or employment in connection with a program. But Sec. 503 does not clearly forbid religious discrimination in the hiring of any employees in a program.

Sec. 503(e) prohibits the use of public funds " . . . in the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is for use for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship." The wording of this prohibition creates problems. May the Secretary fund that portion of an integrated construction project in which no sectarian instruction or religious worship takes place and permit private funding of the remaining integrated areas to be so used without supporting indirectly, and thus unconstitutionally, the entire religious undertaking? See, PEARL v. Nyquist, 413 U.S. 756(1973).

Sec. 203 provides for program monitoring and enforcement, and Sec. 106(b)(17) and (18) provide for evaluation, licensing, inspection, fiscal control, and funding accounting procedures.

We are in agreement that where public funds are expended public monitoring and enforcement must go. For the overwhelming majority of programs contemplated by H.R. 2966 this would cause no serious problem. However, if some of the programs are to be operated by churches or their institutions, additional problems arise. The United States Supreme Court in Walz v. Tax Commissioner, 397 U.S. 664(1969), held excessive entanglement of church and state to be unconstitutional. The requirements of Sec. 203 and Sec. 106 for regular and periodic monitoring of all programs, including those of religious organizations, may well fall within those strictures.

Even if the above objections are dealt with satisfactorily, the bill would present a possibility and even a probability that individual churches and other nonprofit organizations would be tempted to use available public funds to expand their programs of sectarian enlistment, evangelization, and proselytization. Baptist churches often write to the Joint Committee for counsel on the church-state problems of instituting Headstart or day care programs in their church buildings. We suggest to them that they examine their motives. Only if they are seeking to serve the community and its children without attempting any religious education, indoctrination, or evangelism are they probably within the scope of proper church-state relations. Understandably, many of the churches have decided not to undertake the programs. Unless adequate restrictions on religious teaching and indoctrination in child and family services programs are specifically written into this bill, the funds available to churches for these programs will serve as attractive snares for the churches, and those groups which litigate church-state issues will keep the courts' dockets crowded.

H.R. 2966 has much to commend it. There have clearly been alterations to the bill before this stage in its legislative history. It is hoped that the changes necessary to guarantee a proper church-state relationship can be added as a result of this hearing.

Senator STAFFORD. Going by the list, we will invite Ruth Gilbert to speak next.

Ms. GILBERT. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Ruth Gilbert.

I have practiced social work 23 years and have been certified in the State of New York for the past 10 years.

I represent the women's division of the Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church, with a membership of 1 million women in 23,000 local churches throughout the United States, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

For over 100 years women in my organization have been concerned about the conditions of children and their families, both at home and abroad, and to this end have founded, financed, and managed institutions for children and families.

Children's homes, schools, community centers, and hospitals are monuments to their concern throughout the world. In this country at the present time under the management of the national division of the Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church, there are 75 community centers, with 54 providing day care, 5 providing family day care services, and 3 providing foster family care and group home services. It is indeed a privilege to testify on behalf of the child and family services bill, S. 626 and H.R. 2966.

We live in an age when data collection and retrieval systems can inform us about the populace, and enlighten us about trends, and can give us the needed information for social planning to enhance the well-being of the population. If statistics mean anything in a modern society, they certainly should point toward those places where stress will occur in our society, or where it is occurring.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor there were over 30 million women in the labor force in 1968, single women only made up 6 million of these. Women headed 5,300,000 of the 49,800,000 families in 1968. Fifty-one percent of these women family heads were working, and more than three-fifths of these women were the sole support of their families.

At the same time, over 18,000 pre-school children receive no care while their mothers are at work, thousands of others are involved in inadequate custodial care.

Statistics regarding working mothers: During the past two decades employment has become increasingly prevalent among mothers of preschool age children. By 1969, more than half the mothers of children aged 6 to 17 were in the labor force, and 30 percent had children under 6.

While individual care is arranged for children of most working mothers—observations made in my own practice, as well as neighborhood surveys conducted by community action programs with which I have worked, reveal that this care is makeshift, at best, and in an alarming number of cases harmful to the child.

I have personally witnessed instances where from five to eight children were cared for in substandard apartments with no heat in Westchester County, N.Y., by older women too crippled to go out of the home for employment. The source of heat in one instance being the oven and pots of water boiling on the stove.

Another instance, in the State of Alabama, gained attention of anti-poverty workers—a woman provided care for a dozen children, all at the age of 3 and 4 years, in a toolshed, where they sat around a table all day with hands folded on the table, or else.

Accidents, improper disciplinary measures, and no intellectual stimulation at this sensitive age is the result of makeshift arrangements. In spite of the fact that in 1969 there were at least 4 million working mothers with children under 6 years of age, there were only 25,000 licensed or approved day care centers, and family day care homes with capacity to serve 675,000 children.

Ideally, the family provides much needed warm acceptance and long-lasting personal support to both the parents and the children. This is vastly important at this time when the family's major function lies in the emotional and psychological supports for the children, but family life in our country also shows a strain.

Thirteen percent of our children are being reared in one-parent families. A large number of them are being reared in families where the stepparents are present, largely because of earlier divorces and remarriages. One-fourth of our families live in or near poverty with incomes less than $5,000 a year, and about one-fifth of the Nation's families move each year.

Ten million children—6 million white and 4 million minorities. lived in families with income below the poverty level in 1969. Out of the total number of 23 million children under 6 years of age, 3 million lived in families with incomes below the poverty level in 1969.

There are few services to aid our highly mobilized, isolated, and generally fragmented families in times of crisis. Another factor which has been introduced into our society in 1975 in this International Women's Year, which has not yet been reduced to a statistical measure, is the rising expectations and hopes and aspirations of women in our society to not only get an equal chance to develop themselves to their fullest potentials, but also make a contribution to our society, to curing the ills of our society, to participating in Government, to finding cures for disease, to make a contribution insofar as their talents will permit.

For these women—middle class or poor, the socialization and the acculturation of the children is still a prime responsibility.

In my opinion, the Children and Family Services Act, as outlined in S. 626, and in H.R. 2966, will provide the important support for children, for families, and for women. For child development centers can act as an extended family in a time where the nuclear family (mother, father, and children), and in many cases mother and children, have become isolated from grandmothers, aunts, uncles, grandfathers, cousins, and various assorted relatives who act as moral reinforcement, child psychologists, babysitters, child rearing specialists, and offer emotional, physical, and financial support systems.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the need for a family support system. Mothers who are at home need such a system as well as working mothers.

One day or partial day centers—family life education—counseling and therapeutic settings are needed too. The logistics related to getting several children to dentists, pediatricians, fitting shoes, school con-

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 4 - 7

ferences, fitting glasses, various lessons, et cetera, clinics for the poor, is many times a nightmare. Add to this some malfunction or maladjustment, and you have a syndrome which I have termed the "overwhelmed mother."

It is these stay-at-home mothers of working class and middle class families who become alcoholics, suffer depression and become ineffective in the role they wish to most fulfill.

Why is our organization concerned?

Our Judeo-Christian heritage bids us to affirm God's creative love as the basis on which all human relations should be based.

We believe we have a responsibility to innovate, to sponsor, and to evaluate new forms of service that will encourage development of the fullest potential in individuals.

As a church agency our policymaking bodies have gone on record in support of improvements in children's services. The general conference meeting in April 1972, taking note of the changing functions of the family, recorded as part of the record of resolutions passed:

> The most vulnerable group in the world today are children. What they are today determines what tomorrow will be. The church is called to minister in behalf of all children. We must nurture and protect their rights as persons created by God, and in his image.
>
> The hungry child, the abused child, the emotionally disturbed child, these and many others are the future. Whenever there is need, the church has a ministry. The children of the world need the ministry of the church, and at the time of need it pointed out certain needs which are present in the United States today.

The United States has dropped to 13th place in infant mortality. Physical brutality, that is, child abuse, is increasingly widespread. Children have little chance where the child is the property of its parents, the practice of juvenile law has a position of low prestige in the profession. The results of such victimizing is a generation of youths and adults who struggle for identity, trust and the basic values of responsible citizenship.

The church can and must speak out on behalf of children. It can order an environment in which children's rights are protected.

We urge the recognition of child care as a developmental service with tremendous potential for influencing the lives of children and families, therefore we recommend that our local churches initiate and participate in comprehensive family-oriented child-development programs, including health services and child care and early childhood education.

We strongly urge our local churches to become advocates for children in the community so that safeguarding the rights of children may be recognized as a primary responsibility of the church.

We further urge that the United Methodist Church take the lead in implementing the mandate from the White House Conference on Children, that all institutions and programs that affect children must involve children and parents as active participants in this decision-making process.

The extended family of the past is no longer available to many children, children are often deprived of someone outside their immediate families who care and enjoy being with them. Few have experiences with kindly adults.

The church also has lonely older people who need the warmth and joy of children, the church can bring the two together.

Further, the children have a right to grow up in a society which practices love for all God's creations. Racism does its most serious damage to children who have already much against them—poverty, broken homes, hunger, crowded living conditions, et cetera.

We call upon the appropriate United Methodist boards and agencies to study the recommendations from the four White House Conferences on Food and Nutrition, Children and Youth, and Aging, as guides for further planning and action, and the development of programs to eliminate the racism which cripples all children.

In October of 1972, the Women's Division, in its annual meeting, adopted the following resolution:

1. Affiliate with those national organizations (both public and private) which have as their purpose calling the public's attention to the mental health and life adjustment needs of children, and which aim to influence public policy on their behalf. Such affiliation would provide the information needed for distribution to concerned women in the local churches, districts and conferences.

2. Give support to, and cooperate in implementing the recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, and of the follow up efforts, including the establishment of an Institute on Integration of Children's and Family Services in Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

3. Develop, establish and test models of child advocacy, demonstrating the functioning of the church women's organizations as advocates for children, and using the church structure and operations as resources.

4. Encourage local United Methodist Women units to develop models of child advocacy in keeping with their community needs.

5. Cooperate with other units of the church in establishing a nationwide panel of United Methodist Women professionals in the fields of mental health, child welfare and education, who would be willing to serve as consultants to women in local communities who wish to identify local needs, establish direct services, and/or act as advocates for children in their particular locality. The data concerning the network of professional women shall be computerized and retrievable.

6. Encourage local units of United Methodist Women to investigate the need for infant care, day care, afterschool care, and mental health programs for children in their communities, and urge the use of the church buildings to meet this need in cooperation with women in other denominations and organizations, crossing economical classes, racial and ethnic lines. The appropriate section of the National Division will be called upon for guidance, consultation and cooperation.

7. Convey to local church women the importance of child advocacy, and the great needs of children through available publications, communication networks and media to be used in local church groups so that they would be able to act intelligently as a force on legislative issues which concern children and their families.

8. Provide information on the current status of the Agriculture Food Subsidy Program, and how it relates to children and families.

9. Participate in developing a system to monitor community services to eliminate dehumanization.

With these mandates from our policy setting bodies we cannot help but urge you to pass this Child Services and Family Act. We cannot help but extend to you the cooperation of our organization, as well as the resources of our organization. It is for the good of our families and our children and our future that we must join hands in this venture.

We have two important resources to offer—buildings and people. Church buildings are often underutilized during many days of the week and preschool rooms already equipped stand idle. Within the churches there are qualified persons who desire to be helpful and who are available when needed.

This has already been proven by the literally hundreds of church buildings that were quickly utilized in order to make the Headstart program work when it was first conceived. Also the people are already in action, literally thousands of our women are already involved as storytellers, helping to clean up after meals, assisting teachers with children who need a one-to-one relationship, and in many, many ways sharing their talents, their love, if no more than to be someone to hug when a crisis occurs, or a lap to sit on.

It is the essence of good stewardship that the church offers these resources to the community, and in cooperation with other religious and community agencies to seek to establish the childcare centers that will serve the needs of our children and our families.

Children are our hope for the future. We want the future to be better—more just, more free, more joyful than the past. We hope that today's children will grow in grace toward that better future.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for that very good statement.

Now we will invite Mr. Tremitiere to deliver his statement.

But before you do, I would like to welcome two of my colleagues from the House committee, Congressman Hall and Congressman Pressler, to these proceedings.

I will say for their information that we are listening to all the panel on religious organizations first, and then we are going to go to the questions.

Mr. TREMITIERE. Thank you, Senator Stafford.

I will follow my written summary of our larger testimony, because to attempt to speak extemporaneously may lengthen the statement.

I am William C. Tremitiere, manager of children's programs for Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates, a voluntary, nonprofit social service agency, which provides direct services to children and families in the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

Through a variety of services such as day care; treatment programs for emotionally disturbed youngsters; adoption services for the placement of children with special needs; various programs for the mentally retarded, including early diagnosis and treatment; and a range of parent education, communication and family-enrichment services, T-LSA and its related programs annually serve an estimated 9,000 children and their families. Because of the agency's long-term commitment to children and their families, we appreciate the invitation to give testimony on the Child and Family Services Act of 1975.

We commend the sponsors of this proposed legislation for recognizing the devastating pressures on family life and taking the initiative to do something about the situation on a major scale.

We are concerned, however, that in the attempt to provide important flexibility in program design at the local level, there may be insufficient guidelines for the development of preventive and supportive services and, therefore, inadequate stimulation for the implementation of such programs.

We are hopeful that certain modifications may be made in the bill, and that viable, enabling legislation will result. With this objective, we respectfully offer the following observations and recommendations for your consideration.

Our society has traditionally considered the family to have primary influence on the growth and development of children and their values, and has valiantly defended this image against the known and imagined faults of the "welfare states."

Unfortunately, for a sizable segment of our population, spanning all socioeconomic groups, this image of the family in reality is largely a myth. Through conscious plan or default, many parents have relinquished the responsibilities of parenthood to established institutions or to the streets.

Consequently, children often develop value systems and survival techniques in sharp contrast to those held by their parents, or the larger society. Nevertheless, we continue to nurture this myth, and correspondingly resist the provision of supportive services to families or to the family substitutes.

Skyrocketing divorce rates reflect another aspect of the drastic changes affecting family life. Single parents must learn on their own how to survive in a society which is predominantly geared to the two-parent family.

Child abuse and neglect are also on the increase as individual and family frustrations mount. The availability of appropriate services, such as day care and counseling can be crucial at such times.

Inflation, unemployment, and the conflicting demands of a materialistically oriented national lifestyle are rapidly resulting in additional family pressures and, subsequent family breakdown. The family unit is in trouble, and in critical need of help to effectively maintain or to reestablish its most important role in nurturing children.

Countless numbers of children are continuing to be "produced" by men and women, boys and girls, who have limited, or no interest in, or ability to fulfill their parenting responsibilities. Services must be readily available to protect these children and to guarantee their rights. Child advocacy through direct intervention is sometimes essential.

Although parenthood is one circumstance which a majority of adults eventually achieve, it is a situation for which we are ill prepared. Our educational institutions have been grossly inadequate in teaching us how to fulfill parental or family responsibilities. It seems to us imperative that the appropriate institutions of our society gear up immediately to fill this gap.

There are skills and techniques available today which can enable individuals and couples to do a more effective job of parenting and communicating. These skills can be taught at an early age or, in a remedial way, to those already in the parent role.

It appears that this bill clearly presents the opportunity for the development and delivery of such preventive and supportive services.

We would urge that high priority be given to this concern, and that major emphasis be placed on the development of large-scale, universal, parent education programs through this legislation.

A primary emphasis in the act is on the provision of voluntary services to preschool children. While this is an important age to receive positive, preventive services, we must not overlook the need for corresponding services to the parents and other family members. Our plea is for more specific emphasis in the bill on the provision of preventive educational and supportive services to the total family unit.

I am convinced of the importance and viability of the nuclear family. As an agency, T–LSA is committed to strengthening and supporting healthy family life. Congress has the opportunity to help reestablish the family as the most important social unit in American society.

There was a time when the family was directly responsible for providing all basic needs of children. However, for most Americans, this is no longer the case. Our culture has developed institutions to fulfill many of these roles.

We must consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of these institutionalized services, and how they may be modified or supported to do a better job at the functions our society has prescribed for them.

Many providers of services know what has to be done to cope with unmet needs, but they are faced with decreasing financial resources, and confronted with mounting demands for more service. Enabling current programs to expand in necessary areas to efficiently and effectively meet family needs may be the most appropriate target of new legislation.

Voluntary agencies throughout the country have been faced with a decreasing support base as contributions have not kept up with the increasing pressure for more services.

At times of economic hardship, the voluntary or charitable contribution is often the first to be cut from the family budget. More agencies are barely able to survive this reduction in support. Certain of these threatened services are so important in maintaining some stability for families that the Federal Government may be the only source of funds to keep them in operation. Congress should be sensitive to this issue as it considers the legislation in question.

The Child and Family Services Act appropriately emphasizes the need for quality day care. The day care system has not had the capacity to serve all of the children potentially in need of such care.

In addition, many of the day care services have not achieved quality standards. Another major concern is the increasing number of middle income families who are not finding day care services as an option because they cannot afford the cost, or the services simply are not there. We believe this need will grow dramatically in the future.

Within the institutionalized services provided for children and families in the United States at the present time there are vast differences in the quality and quantity of care provided.

I cite foster care as a specific example. We have discovered time and again that children often do not receive adequate medical and dental services while, supposedly, under the protection of the responsible child welfare systems. In addition, some youngsters have even been "lost" in the system. These are concerns which we feel should be addressed on a national level.

The majority of institutionalized services have traditionally tended to be remedial in nature—providing a service after a problem had been identified. It is our profound hope that the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 will be significant in developing preventive services.

In summary, we submit the following recommendations:

One: Major emphasis is needed, through guidelines, and designated funding, for programs which are clearly preventive in nature and supportive of healthy family life.

Services such as parent education and parent-child communication should be readily available to all families and to those who fulfill the parenting role on a temporary or part-time basis such as foster parents, teachers, and day care personnel.

Two: Arbitrary income levels which control the development or delivery of services to children and families tend to perpetuate the separation and segregation which exists within our society.

We are hopeful that this legislation will eliminate those artifical barriers and, therefore, make preventive and supportive services available to all families.

Three: Further identification and clarification of additional programs envisioned by this act would be helpful in the determination of services likely to be implemented or enabled by this legislation.

Four: A major step toward child advocacy would be achieved if this legislation were to give clear recognition to the constitutional rights of children as being clearly distinct from those of their biological parents.

Five: Provisions of the Child and Family Services Act should be equally available to voluntary human service programs as well as to those currently supported partially or in total through local, State or Federal taxes.

Six: This legislation should be rigorous in guaranteeing the development of quality standards of service delivery as measured by program effectiveness and service accountability.

Seven: A concerted effort should be made to develop the means which insure quality care for all children whether they are in their own homes, foster homes, or institutional settings.

Eight: Specialized services should be created to help meet the needs of families faced by problems of separation and divorce, as well as supportive services to families to reduce the potential for child abuse and neglect.

Nine: Adequate funding is needed to enable the development of adequate services for the mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and adjudicated persons who are being moved out of residential or institutional care, and relocated in community based programs.

Ten: Recognition should be given to the concept that certain people will assume a greater responsibility for raising children somewhat in the capacity of "professional parents." These may be people who assume the lifetime commitment of adopting waiting children, foster parents, or those who provide day care. Such individuals or families should not be disadvantaged by legislation which could inhibit this important responsibility.

In conclusion, there is an urgent need for appropriate and sensitive legislative intervention that will guarantee the basic rights of children and the supports necessary to develop and maintain healthy family life for all children in our Nation.

We believe that the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 has the potential of meeting this need.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for that good statement.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Tremitiere follows:]

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE
U. S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH
AND THE
U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SELECT
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
by
Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates

March 13, 1975

A. Introduction

Chairman Mondale, Chairman Brademas, and distinguished members of the Subcommittees - I am William C. Tremitiere, Manager of Childrens' Programs for Tressler-Lutheran Service Associates (T-LSA), a voluntary, non-profit social service agency, which provides direct services to children and families in the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. T-LSA family and childrens' service programs consist of: day care and nursery programs for pre-schoolers with an emphasis on child development; a treatment program for emotionally-disturbed youngsters; a specialized adoption program which focuses on the development of permanent adoptive homes for children with special needs and supportive services to adoptive families; a variety of parent education, communication and individual and family enrichment services; community and congregationally based counseling centers; day care consultation; pre-natal education services; as well as other child-advocacy efforts in community education and social action. Through these various programs, T-LSA provided service to an estimated 8,600 children in 1974. Another 625 children were served by an affiliated program managed by T-LSA known as Ken-Crest. This agency provides service in the Philadelphia Metropolitan area and neighboring Montgomery County in Pennsylvania. The focus of Ken-Crest service is on early identi-

fication and treatment of conditions which handicap children such as: mental retardation; neuro-muscular disorders; learning disabilities; and emotional problems. Professional mental health services are also available. These programs are delivered in a variety of facilities designed to meet the needs of their respective local communities such as: day care centers; a residential care unit; and specialized group homes to enable retarded young adults to achieve semi-independent living.

Since its founding as an orphanage in 1865, T-LSA has attempted to modify its programs and structure to meet current needs and to develop or modify services which will be responsive to anticipated needs generated by mounting pressures in our society. In recent years, the agency has placed increasing emphasis on preventive and supportive services to families in addition to its delivery of direct services. Because of the agency's long-term commitment to children and their families, we appreciate the invitation to give testimony on the "Child and Family Service Act of 1975".

We commend the members of the Committees and other Members of Congress, who have recognized the tremendous pressures affecting children and threatening the traditional values of family life in this Country, and who have, subsequently, co-sponsored this comprehensive legislation. We are concerned, however, in the attempt to provide important flexibility in program design at the local level, there may be insufficient guidelines for the development of preventive and supportive services and, therefore,

inadequate stimulation for the implementation of such programs. The measurement of effectiveness and quality control may also be nearly impossible because of the broad definitions or lack of definition for certain potential services. Because the "Child and Family Service Act of 1975" offers the hope of urgently needed supports to children and family life, we are hopeful that certain modifications may be made in the Bill and that viable, enabling legislation will result. With this objective, we respectfully offer the following observations and recommendations for your consideration.

B. Role of the Family

Our society has traditionally considered the family to have primary influence on the growth and development of children and their values, and has valiantly defended this image against the known and imagined faults of the "welfare state". Unfortunately for a sizable segment of our population, spanning all socio-economic groups, this image of the family in reality is largely a myth. Through conscious plan or default, many parents have relinquished the responsibilities of parenthood to established institutions or to the streets. Consequently, children often develop value systems and survival techniques in sharp contrast to those held by their parents or the larger society. Nevertheless, we continue to nurture this myth and correspondingly resist the provision of supportive services to families or to the family substitutes.

Skyrocketing divorce rates reflect another aspect of the drastic changes affecting family life. Children are often torn between

parents as marriages fall apart and irreparable damage results in family relationships. Single parents must learn on their own how to survive in a society which is predominently geared to the two-parent family.

Child abuse and neglect are also on the increase as individual and family frustrations mount. There has been little or no preparation to help people deal constructively with such pressures. The availability of appropriate services such as day care and counseling can be crucial at such times.

Inflation, unemployment and the conflicting demands of a materialistically oriented national life-style are rapidly resulting in additional family pressures and, subsequent, family breakdown. These are times to add supports to the basic sustaining unit - the family. With all of its weaknesses, I believe the family still offers the most accessible setting in which an individual can find strength, support, and understanding. However, the family unit is in trouble and in critical need of help in order to effectively maintain or re-establish this role.

On the other hand, countless numbers of children are continuing to be "produced" (and I use that term in its most crass sense) by men and women, boys and girls, who have limited or no interest in or ability to fulfill their parenting responsibilities. Mounting rates of crime and delinquency, mental illness among children, increasing illegitimacy, and decreased educational achievement are, I believe, some of the evidence of this irresponsibility on the part of individuals and our society.

Although parenthood is one circumstance which a majority of adults eventually achieve, it is a situation for which we are ill prepared. Our educational institutions are geared to teach reading, mathematics, geography, and, sometimes, nuclear science - but, they have been grossly inadequate in teaching us how to fulfill parental or family responsibilities. With the diminished meaningful contact between parents and their children, it seems to us imperative that the appropriate institutions of our society gear-up immediately to fill this gap. A major redirection of resources and philosophy will be needed to accomplish this objective. The "Child and Family Service Act" may provide the facilitating legislation.

There are skills and techniques available today which can enable individuals and couples to do a more effective job of parenting and communicating. These skills can be taught at an early age or, in a remedial way, to those already in the parent role. It appears that this Bill clearly presents the opportunity for the development and delivery of such preventive and supportive services. We would urge that high priority be given to this concern and that major emphasis be placed on the development of large-scale, universal, parent education programs through this legislation.

Specialized supportive services are needed to assist families in coping with divorce and single parenthood. For instance, situational groups could and should be developed to assist recently separated or divorced individuals in making the adjustment to their new life-style and its miriad demands. The periods immediately following separation and divorce are generally extremely

difficult times - economically, socially, and emotionally. The parents maintaining direct responsibility for the children often have difficulty coping with their own needs at this time, which may decrease their effectiveness in dealing with the needs of their children. We are hearing pleas from hurting people for service to help meet these needs.

A primary emphasis in the Act is on the provision of voluntary services to pre-school children. While this is an important age to receive positive, preventive services, we must not overlook the need for corresponding services to the parents and other family members. It is essential that parents or parent figures be involved in planning and prioritizing services as stressed in this proposed legislation. However, it is at least equally important for them to have access to supportive services themselves. For instance, children may receive the best possible service in a quality day care center but have its benefits regularly erased by returning home to a family situation frought with tension, frustration, and open conflict.

Again, our plea is for more specific emphasis in the Bill on the provision of preventive educational and supportive services to the total family unit. As a parent of thirteen children (three "home-made" and ten adopted), I am convinced of the importance and viability of the nuclear family. As an agency, T-LSA is committed to strengthening and supporting healthy family life. Congress has the opportunity to help re-establish the family as the most important social unit in American Society.

C. Role of Family Substitutes

There was a time when the family was directly responsible for providing all basic needs of children - food, clothing, shelter, health care, developing values, teaching a trade, modeling survival techniques with the world beyond the family, and demonstrating family roles. When the parents were unable to provide for these needs, members of the extended family or others in the clan or tribe stepped in to assume responsibility.

For most Americans, this is no longer the case. Our culture, along with many others, has developed institutions to fulfill many of these roles. Without arguing the merits or demerits of what has happened, we recognize that this is reality. We must then consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of these institutionalized services and how they may be modified or supported to do a better job at the functions our society has prescribed for them. The legislation under consideration by your Committees has the potential of touching upon and possibly improving most, if not all, of these child and family related institutions. We are somewhat concerned that the Act may be too broadly defined or insufficiently funded to have measurable effect on all of these areas of need. We feel that the Congress should be particularly careful not to establish another beaucratic system which could drain off limited resources rather than to translate them into actual service. The Act does emphasize the need for coordinated planning and the expansion of existing quality programs. While many providers of service know what has to be done to cope with unmet needs, they are faced with decreasing financial

resources and confronted with mounting demands for more service. Enabling current programs to expand in necessary areas and stimulating the creation of new approaches to efficiently and effectively meet family needs, may be the most appropriate target of new legislation.

Voluntary agencies throughout the Country have been faced with a decreasing support base as contributions have not kept up with the increasing pressure for more services. Recent changes in the American economic and employment scenes have been personally devastating to countless numbers of Americans. These circumstances have increased pressures on the family and have had a profound effect upon the support of voluntary programs. At times of economic hardship, the voluntary or charitable contribution is often the first item to be cut from the family budget. Many agencies are barely able to survive this reduction in support. Certain of these threatened services are so important in maintaining some stability for families, that the Federal government may be the only source of funds to keep them in operation. Congress should be sensitive to this issue as it considers the legislation in question.

As President of the School Board in the City of York, I am keenly aware of the pressures upon inner city services provided through local taxes. Our community is not unlike other large or medium sized cities around the Country in that we are faced with a decreasing tax base as industry and more economically-secure families move to the suburbs and the center city population becomes disproportionate in its need for services. Again, we are faced with increasing demands and decreasing fiscal resources. For instance,

In our District last year, it was necessary to eliminate the school dental program, elementary guidance counselors, the school social worker, and to cut back in certain educational programs simply to keep the basic education system in operation without raising taxes to the point that they would drive more business, industry, and residents from the community. Other communities are faced with the possibility of reducing the school day, which would result in children entering school later in the morning and being released earlier in the afternoon. This would create additional child care problems for families where both parents must work. Perhaps this legislation can enable public schools to maintain, if not to increase, the services which are now being threatened.

The "Child and Family Service Act" appropriately emphasizes the need for quality day care. For many Americans this has become an essential service by enabling both parents the freedom to work and to meet, at least in part, their economic needs. The day care "system", however, has not had the capacity to serve all of the children potentially in need of such care. In addition, many of the day care services have not achieved quality standards. We are encouraged that this legislation recognizes the need for monitoring day care and other services to be certain that established standards are met. It has been our experience, however, that many of the existing standards for day care are beautifully written to assure administrative effectiveness but are essentially ineffective in guaranteeing the quality of human dynamics, which is so important. Programs such as those developed by T-LSA are striving to provide this quality of service for children but it is a challenge to maintain service in light of decreasing support and corresponding financial pressures on the families.

Our day care programs serve children from all walks of life. In order to do so, we must maintain a fee schedule which is equitable for all families. Consequently, the agency must underwrite the cost for all families on a deficit basis. Certain limited funds are available to provide service for low-income families. High income families can also afford service if it is accessible to them. However, an increasing number of middle income families are not finding day care services as an option because they cannot afford the cost or the services simply are not there. We believe this need will grow dramatically in the future.

Proprietary or profit-making day care facilities have also provided a service in this area. We are concerned about the inherent danger of such services because the focus may tend to be on cost-saving rather than on service-effectiveness. This is not meant to be a blanket criticism of this type of service but to indicate an area of concern. Unfortunately, many private day care services, either in private homes or in centers, have been isolated from similar voluntary and tax supported programs which generally expend greater effort and resources in staff training and program development. In addition to quality control, per se, this legislation could achieve significant results by fostering the development of training programs which would require the involvement of proprietary day care providers.

Other needs are being recognized in the day care field as long-established major residential programs operating in the areas of mental health, mental retardation, and justice are striving to move their residents back to their communities. This change,

while very beneficial for many reasons, is creating new challenges at the local level. Additional funds are needed to develop these community-based facilities and to enable families to cope with the increased responsibility for their relatives in these settings.

Within the institutionalized services provided for children and families in the United States at the present time there are vast differences in the quality and quantity of care provided. I cite foster care as a specific example. Through our adoptive placement experience, we have discovered time and again that children often do not receive adequate medical and dental services while, supposedly, under the protection of the responsible child welfare systems. In addition, some youngsters have even been "lost" in the system. These are concerns which we feel should be addressed on a national level.

The majority of institutionalized services have traditionally tended to be remedial in nature - providing a service after a problem has been identified. There are, and have been, efforts to provide services of a preventive nature but these have been limited because of the priorities resulting from limited resources. It is our profound hope that the "Child and Family Service Act of 1975" will be significant in meeting this need.

D. Recommendations

1. Major emphasis is needed, through guidelines and designated funding, for programs which are clearly preventive in nature and supportive of healthy family life. Services such as parent education and parent-child communication should be readily available to all families and to those who fulfill the parenting role on a temporary or part-time basis such as:

foster parents, teachers, and day care personnel.

2. Arbitrary income levels which control the development or delivery of services to children and families tend to perpetuate the separation and segregation which exists within our society. We are hopeful that this legislation will eliminate those artificial barriers and, therefore, make preventive and supportive services available to all families.

3. Further identification and clarification of additional programs envisioned by this Act would be helpful in the determination of services likely to be implemented or enabled by this legislation.

4. A major step toward child advocacy would be achieved if this legislation were to give clear recognition to the Constitutional rights of children as being clearly distinct from those of their biological parents.

5. Provisions of the "Child and Family Service Act" should be equally available to voluntary human service programs as well as to those currently supported partially or in total through local, state, or federal taxes.

6. This legislation should be rigorous in guaranteeing the development of quality standards of service delivery as measured by program effectiveness and service accountability.

7. A concerted effort should be made to develop the means which insure quality care for all children whether they are in their own homes, foster homes, or institutional settings.

8. Specialized services should be created to help meet the needs of families faced by problems of separation and divorce, as well as supportive services to families to reduce the potential for child abuse and neglect.

9. Adequate funding is needed to enable the development of adequate services for the mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and adjudicated persons who are being moved out of residential or institutional care and relocated in community based programs.

10. Recognition should be given to the concept that certain people will assume a greater responsibility for raising children somewhat in the capacity of "professional parents". These may be people who assume the lifetime commitment of adopting waiting children, foster parents, or those who provide day care. Such individuals or families should not be disadvantaged by legislation which could inhibit this important responsibility.

E. Conclusion

There is an urgent need for appropriate and sensitive legislative intervention that will guarantee the basic rights of children and the supports necessary to develop and maintain healthy family life for all children in our Nation. We believe that the "Child and Family Service Act of 1975" has the potential of meeting this need.

Senator STAFFORD. The Chair will recognize the gentlelady from New York, Mrs. Chisholm, for questions.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

There are so many questions that I desire to ask, but I will try to limit them to four basic questions that I have in mind.

First of all, I would like to ask Reverend Reese to respond to this question.

There has been a great deal of talk today on the panel with respect to the fact that the services outlined in these bills will help to strengthen the family.

Yet, on the other hand, we have numbers of peoples and groups in this country who look upon these services as services to weaken the family, depending on their interpretation of the family unit.

Could you elaborate a little bit on that?

Monsignor REESE. Yes, Mrs. Chisholm.

I think we have to face the fact that under present circumstances there are millions of children just rattling around the community because their parents have to work, and there are not adequate provisions being made for them.

The present situation certainly is not conducive to good family living. I think developing programs that will provide proper care for the children would be a step in the strengthening of family life.

Furthermore, these bills incorporate involvement of the parents. It is not as though the States are taking these children over. As a matter of fact it is requiring that the parents be involved in planning and advisory committees, and so forth, and it even specifies that some of these committees have to have 50-percent participation and membership on the part of the parents.

It seems to me that the average parent, or one of the best avenues of access to a parent is through the child, and it seems to me that these programs provide a method of getting parents involved initially as far as their own child is concerned.

It provides an opportunity for helping them to develop their capability of being parents, and certainly in the end would strengthen family life.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much.

The reason I asked this question is because there are people who really do feel that this is some kind of socialistic approach, without dealing with the raw, hard naked facts concerning the realities of life in our country today.

I wanted to make sure that this is brought out for the record.

I would like to address this question to Dr. Baker.

You raise the issue of the fact that the bills seem to concentrate a great deal on working mothers and single mothers. And there are other categories of parents who need the service just as much as these specific groups.

I think the other members of the Committee would agree with me in saying that we do recognize, and we see the possibility for having services on a broad basis, but we are addressing ourselves primarily, in the bills right now, to priority of concerns.

We do not want you to feel, or your organization, to feel that we are neglecting other groups.

Dr. BAKER. I think, though, my point, and Ms. Gilbert also brought it up, there are a lot of people who are serving these days as sort of "in lieu of" parents, and aunts, uncles, those that she mentioned, and somehow it seems to me that the way the thing is worded now—I realize the need to narrow the scope of the thing—yet, at the same time I think you are going to cut out some of the children who need the services even more than of biological parents at home.

I think we would regret it if these children were not given some assistance in the process.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

Ms. Gilbert, I would like to ask you a question.

You mentioned the historical role of the churches being concerned with human beings, and of course being concerned about children.

You further indicated that church groups and church organizations have a great deal of space that is not really being used, or used to the fullest during the regular week, and could be used for child care centers, and different services as needed.

Now, the one issue that was raised by Dr. Baker is the question of proselytizing, should we think about having some very stringent regulations or rules written into the bill in order to prevent private and public groups that provide child care from covertly or overtly religiously indoctrinating the children.

Do you have suggestions as to how that can be done?

Ms. GILBERT. I believe those aspects of the bills prohibit discrimination against participating on the program, based on creed, and so forth, is one way.

I think that another way would be to require those standards, professional standards, 4(c) standards, and so forth, which employ professionals in the provision of the service, professionals in the early childhood education would be committed to providing a professionally oriented child development service which would not include proselytization, I believe.

Such standards already exist on the part of the national church agencies that provide moneys, for subsidizing local church efforts.

So we are already organized to achieve this end, so that we are providing a community service which is separate and apart from the religious education program of the church. It is even administered under a different church body, different church corporation.

Religious education is done by people in one part of the country, and the professional health and welfare services would be administered and supervised by another in another part of the country.

So we are trying to be careful about that ourselves.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much, Ms. Gilbert.

Mr. Tremitiere, you gave to us a list of recommendations to print in the legislation, or to be included in the legislation.

I wonder if you would comment on the fact that many States in our Nation who perhaps do not have good basic child care standards, who perhaps are really functioning on very minimum levels, may view the Federal Government's establishment of Federal guidelines as encroaching on State's right.

We can hear these States' rights individuals saying that is the role of the State.

Do you feel that it is important enough, since children are involved here, that the U.S. Congress should be involved in terms of just setting up some very, very basic guidelines that will be applicable to all centers and institutions serving the needs of children, so at least we have some kind of standardization with respect to our children?

I would like to get your comments on that.

Mr. TREMITIERE. I think the rights of the individuals in our society, specifically in this case, the rights of a child, are more important than the States' rights issue.

I think States and local communities, and other child caring levels within our system have had an opportunity to provide adequate care for children. We are in a situation today where we know this has absolutely not been done.

Within States there are great disparities in the amount of care and the quality of care provided children; that same difference occurs from one State to another.

I think all children have the right to quality care in this country, and perhaps the only way to insure that is through some Federal legislation that would set those standards and enforce them.

We would feel very strongly that is a very important issue.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much.

No further questions.

Senator STAFFORD. Mr. Pressler.

Mr. PRESSLER. I had three questions, and Congresswoman Chisholm has asked two of them more eloquently than I, and the third one is the question that those of us who are very much in strong support of this legislation very frequently run into.

I am a cosponsor to this bill in the House. In addition to the question that has been asked concerning the effect it has on family life, some people seem to feel that centers such as this result in a weakening rather than a strengthening of family life. I tend to disagree with that.

But the second area that I run into frequently, and I would like to address this question to any one on the panel who wants to take it, is the administration of social programs at a local level.

We here in Congress can appropriate money with the best intentions, but it seems, to get this money down to the people who it is intended for, in the area of social administration in the United States, and particularly when it seems that the best intentions of people are perhaps the worst administrators in some way, because they lack the element of toughness, and maybe that is a bad word to use, but what can we do about this to get this?

It is almost like a machine, that as you get down to the real objective, that link that I call administration seems weak in the social programs. What can we do about that in terms of child care? Does anybody want to tackle that?

Monsignor REESE. I think it ties in with the comment I made about the need to have flexibility as far as prime sponsors are concerned, so that you do not have the program become a monopoly of a single system, political system, for example.

I think it is important that knowledge of the availability, the presence of the program, be spread so that groups that have an interest would know that the program is possible, and they should be given some technical assistance, and this is one of the real problems in preparing the proposal.

I can see this program being very attractive to some neighborhood organizations, for example, that are in existence, and are concerned about the kinds of problems that it is addressing itself to, and this again is tied into the requirement that in the planning field and in the management that there be a high percentage of the parents directly involved.

So I think that this proposal incorporates—more than most of the social welfare legislation I am familiar with—a kind of corrective mechanism to the very point you are making. Because it does require direct parental involvement of people who have kids in the program.

I think they would bird dog it, and watch dog it in a way that frequently is not done in social programs.

Mr. BAKER. This does not really get altogether to your question on how you administer such an animal once you create it.

I think Mrs. Chisholm, in part, raised the issue of some kind of uniform standards that have to be involved somewhere down the line. I do not know how you do it.

This gets back to one of the points that I made, that I am afraid—I guess Baptists are overly sensitive about the involvement of the Government in our own day-to-day operations, and this is where you get into the question of entanglement.

The court, in the *Walsh* case, made it very clear that there could not be excessive entanglement of church and state. I think you get into a situation where you are "damned if you do, and damned if you don't" when you are dealing with churches.

I think you are going to have to have the kind of supervision and monitoring which the bill calls for. I think the lines have to be very clear, so that this does not inevitably build up another bureaucracy which we need like we need a hole in the head.

This is the problem that you get going round and round. I do not have an answer.

Ms. GILBERT. I would like to offer a comment.

I believe that the citizenry must have a direct line to the funding source, so that they may voice their opinions about the way the program is operating, and about the personnel.

We do find people who are administering such social welfare programs on a local level to be overly punitive and overly judgmental in many cases. I think we professionals also are sometimes tyrannical in that we think we have all the answers.

I think the mothers, especially mothers and fathers, and concerned citizens, should be able to complain, and should be heard, and if there is a grant made to a particular sponsoring organization, that does not seem to be meeting the cultural or the educational or the particular unique needs of the particular community, that that community ought to be able to have a parallel program under also strict standards.

Mr. TREMITIERE. I would like to underscore a comment Ms. Gilbert made.

That is, the importance of client evaluation of services. I think the field of human services has traditionally resisted feedback from clients. I believe there is a tendency of professionals in any field to resist having people evaluate what they are doing.

However, the whole question of accountability forces us into a position in all phases of public services, whether voluntarily or tax

supported, to be certain that the services we are providing are the most effective services we can deliver for each dollar.

Effectiveness is a factor the client can help evaluate perhaps better than anyone else in the system. We feel that the human service delivery programs throughout the country, regardless of size, need to find better ways to deliver service at less cost in administrative areas. Social service administration today must be responsive to the need for accountability.

The comments that Ms. Gilbert made regarding judgmental attitudes of personnel on the local levels also should be acknowledged as existing at the State and Federal levels in the bureaucratic system. Perhaps more direct lines to funding source are extremely important, not only from the client, but from those who are delivering services at the grass root level.

Mr. PRESSLER. Thank you. I have no further questions.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Pressler.

Might I just remind the members of the joint committee that we have two more panels following this one, and while the Chair does not intend to limit questions, the press of later business may do that as it is.

Mr. Hall.

Mr. HALL. In that circumstance, Mr. Chairman, I have no questions.

Senator STAFFORD. In that case, Mr. Hall, I am almost constrained to use your time.

Mr. HALL. It seems like I should make a rather profound comment, but I will just say that the family existed before agencies or Congress.

Senator STAFFORD. The Chair is going to submit two or three questions to the members of this panel in writing, and if the members would be willing to supply answers in writing, it would be very helpful to the committee, and would save our time this morning.

I will go directly to one of the issues that we encounter as members of both the Senate and the House Committees. That is, we hear criticism, and we will have to meet criticism, no doubt, that the type of legislation we are considering today is a type that some claim tends to weaken, rather than strengthen, the American family.

I would invite each of you to briefly comment to this committee your belief, and I assume you have it, that this legislation actually strengthens, rather than weakens the American family.

Mr. BAKER. I feel strongly that it does. I do not see any merit in the argument that I have heard to the contrary.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you.

Ms. Gilbert.

Ms. GILBERT. I think that the arguments imply some form of coersion which I do not see in the legislation. Therefore I would agree that it is a matter of choice, and therefore strengthens the family.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you.

Mr. Tremitiere.

Mr. TREMITIERE. Senator, I would see the question as similar to asking if a glass is half full or half empty. It depends on the point of view of the person asking that question as to whether or not they would see it as supportive or destructive and damaging.

I think the bill is supportive, and would provide tremendous resources to families.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you.

Monsignor?

Monsignor REESE. Senator, I would say that it would seem to me that a person who would think that these programs would weaken the family is just not aware of the facts of life.

There are, in fact, millions of children with no provision for their care and development, and certainly these programs would make a big contribution toward that.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Let me ask the panel for a brief comment on also whether or not the existing Headstart program might serve as a basis upon which to build in the child care area?

Ms. GILBERT. Having been a director of Headstart Day Care Center, I would like to comment on that.

I believe the bill offers a great deal more flexibility in the provision of services—the round-the-clock full year program which has not an age limit, and which is more than an education which is support for the entire family, which would mean counselling and other services. I believe that there can be a division of responsibility so that in a community these two programs might work hand in glove.

Senator STAFFORD. Does anybody else care to comment?

If not, one final question from the Chair for anybody on the panel who cares to respond.

That is, what is the role of the parent in the operation of the day care center, and specifically, what do the words "direct involvement" mean?

Does anybody care to respond to that?

Monsignor REESE. The bills, both versions, provide for significant parental involvement in two areas. One on the management committee at various levels, and secondly, in planning.

It seems to me that in addition it provides opportunity for parent education and for counseling, consultation. But I think the most important thing would be the direct involvement of the parent, either as staff members, or volunteers, or whatever, whereby they could be exposed to good practices of child care, and this would involve nutrition, and all kinds of things, they could then carry over into their own family living situation.

This is the way I would see the problem.

Senator STAFFORD. Would anybody else care to comment?

Ms. GILBERT. I believe there is also a place for parents to be involved in the philosophy of education. There are several philosophies of education.

I will give an example. In some preschool programs the philosophy is strictly what is known as developmental. This philosophy involves the provision of chance for children to relate to each other, to play out certain roles.

Then there is another philosophy which would require that the preschool children begin to learn as soon as possible. So this one has electric typewriters and all of the technological equipment to help preschool children to learn as much as possible. That might be two different kinds.

I think the parents should have the right to choose which kind of program, which kind of educational philosophy they want their child to begin in at this early age.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Tremitiere.

Mr. TREMITIERE. I would just like to add a brief comment to that.

We would certainly agree with the reactions that you have received so far to that question.

I would add, however, that I think there is a need for parents to have information about what their children are learning in these settings, because in many cases parents are somewhat lost, and somewhere behind where their youngsters are.

Children today are learning so much, and seeing so much about the world, things that many of the parents have not been exposed to.

Perhaps the parents will feel much greater distance from their children unless the feedback is included in the process. I think it has to be a two-way involvement, on a very voluntary basis.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

The Chair, unless there are other questions, wishes to express its appreciation both to the Senate and House Joint Committee members for your testimony and for your appearance here this morning. We will consider the hearing closed as far as you are concerned.

We will call the next panel. I think we can combine the next two panels: Ms. Marilyn Marcosson, Mrs. Mary Allen Jolley, Mrs. Lillie Herndon, and Dr. Janet Heddesheimer.

We will invite the panelists to identify themselves, starting at your right and my left.

STATEMENT OF MARY ALLEN JOLLEY, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY MS. MARILYN MARCOSSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE, INC.; MRS. LILLIE E. HERNDON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, ACCOMPANIED BY MRS. ANN LAHR, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS LEGISLATIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE; MS. DANA FRIEDMAN, INFORMATION SPECIALIST, DAY CARE AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.; AND DR. JANET HEDDESHEIMER, COORDINATOR, HEAD START CHILDREN, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS AFL-CIO

Mrs. JOLLEY. Thank you.

I am Mary Allen Jolley, director of public affairs, American Home Economics Association.

Ms. MARCOSSON. I am Marilyn Marcosson, executive director, American Parents Committee.

Mrs. HERNDON. I am Lillie E. Herndon, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and with me is Ann Lahr of our legislative services committee.

Ms. FRIEDMAN. I am Dana Friedman, information specialist for the Day Care and Child Development Council.

Ms. HEDDESHEIMER. I am Janet Heddesheimer, Government relations committee, American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

We will start at the left.

Mrs. Jolley.

Mrs. JOLLEY. The American Home Economics Association supports the legislation before this committee to provide child care services and family support services.

Our members believe that child care legislation should be high on the list of priorities in the 94th Congress. Already you have received much evidence about the urgent needs of children and their families. I would simply point to the necessity for this legislation by reminding you of the following significant facts:

One: First, there are many social indicators which point to the enormous problems facing children and their families. A task force of extension home economists has identified the following as indicators of the magnitude of concern:

Four million new births in the 1970's;

One of every ten 17-year-old girls is a mother;

Nearly one-third of all teenage marriages end in divorce;

One of five marriages is broken;

One child in six will lose a parent by divorce by the time he is 18 years old;

Approximately 10 percent of all school-age children have moderate to severe emotional problems;

Nearly 26 million children are represented by 12.7 million working mothers—5.5 million of these children are under 6 years of age;

Twelve percent of all families are headed by women. 53 percent of these women are in the labor force. Their median income is $6,116;

Only about 8 percent of group day care centers provide truly developmental child care; about 21 percent provide limited developmental care; few family day care homes offer developmental opportunities; two-thirds are custodial care only.

Two: Second, the importance of the first 5 years in the life of a child cannot be overestimated. We know that during these very critical years, attitudes, habits, values, intelligence, health—literally every aspect of a child's character and his mental and physical well-being are vitally affected at this early stage of development.

Thus, we believe that services to children and their families hold potential for reducing the human and financial costs which result from a deprived childhood.

A study by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck has reinforced this concept. Their study dealt with 500 delinquent teenagers and 500 nondelinquent teenagers. They looked at many measures of both groups including medical histories, psychiatric and psychological examinations. A final interpretation of all the data and measurements led the researchers to conclude that all factors, save parental influence, fade in importance in establishing the differences between these two groups of adolescents.

One brief comment about the general approach to child and family services which seems to us to be inherent in the bills which we support, S. 626 and H.R. 2966.

We believe that the comprehensive services provided for in these bills, including the involvement of parents and the possibilities that

exist for use of various delivery systems of child care and family services, provide a sound approach for the optimum development of all family members. No one group owns the field of child care and development, and no single approach to child care and family services can possibly meet the variety of needs that may exist with various forms of family.

The term "family" has come to encompass more than the traditional form of father, mother, and children. The family today connotes many patterns ranging from adults living together to a single adult with responsibility for children or other adults.

It should be safe to predict that as family interactions with social and other environments continue to bring transition for families, that the nurturing and socialization of children will likewise change. At the same time, the family will continue to be the most humane, efficient and economical system for making human beings human. But, with all its strengths, the family cannot function without support from the community and neighborhood, from the world of work, and from social and political institutions at local, State, and national levels.

Thus, the importance of a comprehensive approach to child care and family services if we do, indeed, intend to help and strengthen all families. We see this philosophy as undergirding the provisions of the legislation now under consideration.

Apart from the acute needs of society which we believe this legislation addresses, home economists have professional concerns about many aspects of the child care and family services bills.

For example, we see ourselves involved in the training and preparation of professional and paraprofessional personnel who will provide services for children and their families. We can provide expertise in developing standards to assure quality in facilities and programs. We have a significant role to play in providing food and nutritional services. And, finally, we believe that home economists constitute a major resource for the delivery of high quality child care and family services in various agencies and settings.

We are interested in all these aspects of the legislation, but I would like to briefly focus on two settings in which home economists constitute a major resource for implementation of programs envisioned in this legislation.

In terms of delivering child care services to rural areas, we believe our capabilities are especially significant. This capability has a long history and tradition of Federal support, and was created by the Congress when it passed the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act created the Cooperative Extension Service to help people improve their homes, farms, and communities. The Federal Government, the State and local governments, and land-grant colleges and universities in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands all participate in supporting this national out-of-school educational program for adults and youths in cities, small towns, and rural areas. Approximately 3,000 extension home economists, located in more than 3,000 extension offices in every State and county throughout the Nation, are now assisting families in finding better ways to manage home and family living problems.

These extension agents are supported in each State by administrative staff and research specialists in the land-grant colleges.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 created a Federal-State-local administrative structure to support vocational home economics programs in the public schools for youths and adults.

Today there are 45,000 home economics teachers in programs enrolling 3,884,724 students—3,193,987 are secondary students; 30,075 are postsecondary students; and 660,662 are adults.

Students enrolled in high school programs have opportunities for learning parenting and child care skills as a part of family life education. In many instances, these learning experiences are centered around caring for children in a day care setting where students can observe developmental processes and interpersonal relationships.

Other areas included in high school home economics are nutrition, housing and clothing, home management, and consumer decisionmaking skills.

In addition, there are high school and postsecondary students enrolled in occupational courses designed to prepare for jobs as paraprofessionals in day care, as dietetic aides, homemaking aides, and institutional management aides.

Adult programs offer opportunities for learning a variety of skills necessary for optimum use of time and economic resources, as well as other family life skills.

We are convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the skills of these home economists in extension and education should, and will be utilized at State and local levels where prime sponsors will be implementing child care and family service programs.

We submit that this network of 48,000 professionals who work in extension and public education, in both rural and urban areas, possess unique skills for working with children and their families. Many are specialists in child development and family life who work in research and teaching to develop the knowledge base that is necessary to enable home economists to work more effectively with families.

Others are more broadly prepared, but there is a core of concepts common to all training and professional preparation of home economists.

As a minimum, at the bachelor's level, these 48,000 home economists will have studied general psychology, educational psychology, developmental and adolescent psychology, marriage, sociology of family, family relationships, and current issues in child development which include the observation of young children. Supporting areas include studies in chemistry, physiology, biology, and nutrition.

I would also point out, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be an aura of acceptance for cooperative extension and for vocational home economics programs in the public schools. Over the years, both programs have continued to grow and expand. Many people, particularly those adults who live in rural areas, have grown accustomed to going to Cooperative Extension workers for answers to their problems.

This credibility is based on accessibility to people, backup from knowledge and research that exists with specialists in the land grant colleges, and the ability of home economists to provide education in unstructured and informal settings, and to provide individualized learning experiences.

One dramatic example of this credibility can be found in the expanded food and nutrition education program implemented by extension home economists.

Of the 50 million families in the United States, more than 5 million have incomes below the poverty level.

In 1968, the U.S. Department of Agriculture allocated $10 million to cooperative extension for a pilot program for reaching these low-income families with programs of nutrition education. The program was successful to the point that Congress has directly funded it at the level of $50 million.

To date, the expanded food and nutrition education program has reached more than 1,076,882 families who are enrolled in intensive nutrition education programs. An additional 701,000 families have been identified and worked with at a less intensive level.

Families are reached by program aides who are recruited and are continuously trained and supervised by extension home economists to teach adults. More than 22,000 aides have been employed since the program began.

Through a 1-to-1 approach, aides knock on doors to locate homemakers. In other cases, neighbors or local agencies refer them to homes. Their job, once they get past the front door, is to help homemakers improve their diets and those of family members.

Extension home economists, including specialists in nutrition, have developed many teaching tools to help aides in their work, such as nutrition lesson plans, simple handout leaflets, and small flip charts. Once homemakers learn from the 1-to-1 teaching experience, aides then encourage them to join small groups. This program has reached low-income families in rural and urban areas, on Indian reservations, and has reached concentrations of Mexican-American families who are isolated from the mainstream by poverty, culture, and language.

Almost as if in anticipation of the proposed legislation, in 1972 the Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., initiated a pilot program with these objectives:

To design and test an informal continuing education program with family day care mothers.

To insure that educational program and supportive services meet the needs of family day care mothers as they perceive them.

To determine the roles that cooperative extension can play as trainer of indigenous family day care educators.

To test the feasibility of cooperative extension in the role of broker between family day care givers and those whose children need family day care.

To explore the coordinating and leadership roles cooperative extension should play in linking with agencies responsible for comprehensive child care in a community.

The program has operated out of storefronts in Nassau County on Long Island, N.Y. This urban-suburban county, with a population of 1.5 million, has 236 licensed family day care homes, but estimates place the number of unlicensed homes at many times that figure.

The target area for the operation of the family day care pilot program is in three contiguous villages which have a population of 77,000.

This includes 27,336 children under age 18. Of these, 7,000 are 5 years or younger.

In Roosevelt, where the storefront center is located, more than one-fourth of the population is receiving public assistance, mostly in the category of aid to dependent children. The percent of working mothers in the target area is estimated to exceed the national survey which reports that 4 out of every 10 mothers are working. Approximately 500 children in the target area are served in half- and full-day licensed arrangements, which include Headstart, prekindergarten, BOCES Living Room School, and licensed family day care.

The Roosevelt project has consisted of a community based resource center for family day care parents to share ideas and experiences. Information educational programs have been planned with family day care parents, including meetings, workshops, and trips to community resources.

In addition, the storefront center has planned activities for children while family day care parents attend training. A monthly newsletter has been published to provide a communications link between family day care parents. Teenage aides have been recruited to work with children in family day care homes. An advisory committee helps to determine program directions. And the center has also served as a "matchmaker" between parents seeking family day care and family day care providers.

Many community agencies have cooperated in this pilot effort in family day care.

Feedback and evaluations on this program have been very positive.

During the next year, the program will expand to increase the number of family day care mothers; assistance will be provided to the Department of Social Service to organize groups of licensed family day care mothers in other geographical areas in the country to involve them in continuing education programs now underway.

During the current year, there are plans to train an estimated 300 family day care mothers. Specialists working in the project will also include Department of Social Services staff in educational programs so that the mandated monthly home visits can be more meaningful to both the caseworkers and the family day care mothers.

Already there has been growth in the level of community awareness and support of family day care. The cooperative extension family day care program has had an impact on affecting these changes.

The capacity for outreach to families, the specialized knowledge that extension specialists and agents possess for helping children and their families will be a major resource for State and local prime sponsors in implementing the proposed child care and family services programs.

We also see home economics departments in hundreds of high schools as having potential for contributing to child care and family services programs.

Again, many of these now conduct day care and kindergarten programs as an integral part of the instruction for high school students enrolled in family life and child development programs. Again, this is a resource that is available in both rural and urban areas—for strengthening and augmenting the delivery of services to children and their families.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, home economists not only support these two bills, H.R. 2966 and S. 626, but we feel that their comprehensive approach toward services to children and families tend to strengthen the concept of the importance of family to society.

Hopefully, when implemented, these programs may reverse the fragmentation of family influence to which many present day ills are attributed.

We also dedicate our considerable resources of organization and expertise in the field to the wise use of facilities and funds which will be made available upon enactment of the bills.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before these subcommittees in behalf of the American Home Economics Association.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Jolley and attachment follow:]

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 4 - 9

STATEMENT OF MARY ALLEN JOLLEY
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION
2010 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C.
Before the
Joint Hearing of the Senate Subcommittees on
Children and Youth, and on Employment, Poverty
and Migratory Labor and the Select Subcommittee
on Education, U.S. House of Representatives

Room 4232 Dirksen Senate Office Building
March 13, 1973, 9:30 a.m.

Child and Family Services Bills, S. 626 and H.R. 2966

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittees:

I am Mary Allen Jolley, Director of Public Affairs for the American Home Economics Association, a national organization of more than 52,000 men and women who work as home economists in a variety of settings...

...as teachers in elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, and in adult education programs;

...in cooperative extension at State and county levels;

...in institutional administration as managers and dieticians;

...in community service in health, welfare, rehabilitation, child care, and consumer agencies;

...in business, as specialists in marketing, communications, and product testing; and

...as college students preparing to become home economists.

The American Home Economics Association supports Federal legislation for child care programs, and I am here to speak in support of H.R. 2966 and S. 626, bills to authorize Federal funds to provide services to children and their families. Attached to my statement is a resolution adopted by the AHEA House of Delegates (1973) pointing to the need for the types of programs and services envisioned in the bills before these Subcommittees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Our members believe that child care legislation should be high on the list of priorities in the 94th Congress. Already you have received much evidence about the urgent needs of children and their families. I would simply point to the necessity for this legislation by reminding you of the following significant facts:

1. First, there are many social indicators which point to the enormous problems facing children and their families. A Task Force of Extension Home Economists has identified the following indicators of the magnitude of concern:[1/]

- 4 million new births in the 1970's.
- one of every ten 17-year-old girls is a mother.
- nearly one-third of all teenage marriages end in divorce.
- one of five marriages is broken.
- one child in six will lose a parent by divorce by the time he is 18 year old.
- approximately 10 percent of all school-age children have moderate to severe emotional problems.
- nearly 26,000,000 children are represented by 12.7 million working mothers; 5.5 million of these children are under six years of age.
- twelve percent of all families are headed by women; 53 percent of these women are in the labor force; their median income is $5,114.
- only about eight percent of group day-care centers provide truly developmental child care; only about 21 percent provide limited developmental care; few family day-care homes offer developmental opportunities; two-thirds are custodial care only.

2. Second, the importance of the first five years in the life of a child cannot be overestimated. We know that during these very critical years attitudes, habits, values,

1/ Focus II, 1974, report of Task Force, Home Economics Subcommittee, Extension Committee on Policy, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

intelligence, health,...literally every aspect of a child's character and his mental and physical well-being are vitally affected at this early stage of development. Thus, we believe that services to children and their families hold potential for reducing the human and financial costs which result from a deprived childhood. A study by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck has re-inforced this concept. Their study dealt with 500 dalinquant teenagers, and 500 non-delinquent teenagers. They looked at many measures of both groups, including medical histories, psychiatric and psychological examinations. A final interpretation of all the data and measurements led the researchers to onclude that All Factors, SAVE PARENTAL INFLUENCE, fade in importance in establishing the differences between these two groups of adolescents.2/

One brief comment about the general approach to child and family services which seems to us to be inherent in the bills which we support, S. 626 and H.R. 2966. We believe that the comprehensive services provided for in these bills, including the involvement of parents and the possibilities that exist for use of various delivery systems of child care and family services, provide a sound approach for the optimum development of all family members. No one group owns the field of child care and development, and no single approach to child care and family services can possibly meet the variety of needs that may exist with various forms of family. The term "family" has come to encompass more than the traditional form of father, mother and children. The family today connotes many patterns ranging from adults living together to a single adult with responsibility for children or other adults. It should be safe to predict that as family interactions with social and other environments continue to bring transition for families, that the nurturing and socialization of children will likewise change. At the same time, the family will continue to be the most /humane, efficient, and economical system for making human beings human. But with all its strengths

2/ Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1950.

the family cannot function without support from the community and neighborhood, from the world of work, and from social and political institutions at local, state, and national levels. Thus the importance of a comprehensive approach to child care and family services if we do, indeed, intend to help and strengthen all families. We see this philosophy as undergirding the provisions of the legislation now under consideration.

Apart from the acute needs of society which we believe this legislation addresses, home economists have professional concerns about many aspects of the child care and family services bills. For example, we see ourselves involved in the training and preparation of professional and para-professional personnel who will provide services for children and their families; we can provide expertise in developing standards to assure quality in facilities and programs; we have a significant role to play in providing food and nutritional services; and finally, we believe that home economists constitute a major resource for the delivery of high quality child care and family services in various agencies and settings. We are interested in all these aspects of the legislation, but I would like to briefly focus on two settings in which home economists constitute a major resource for implementation of programs envisioned in this legislation. In terms of delivering child care services to rural areas, we believe our capabilities are especially significant. This capability has a long history and tradition of Federal support, and was created by the Congress when it passed the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act created the Cooperative Extension Service to help people improve their homes, farms, and communities. The Federal government, the State and local governments, and land grant colleges and universities in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, all participate in supporting this national out-of-school educational program for adults and youth in cities, small towns, and rural areas. Approximately 3,400 extension home economists, located in more than 3,000 extension offices in every State and county throughout the Nation, are now assisting families in finding better ways to manage home and family living problems. These extension agents are

supported in each state by administrative staff and research specialists in the land grant colleges.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 created a Federal-State-local administrative structure to support vocational home economics programs in the public schools for youth and adults. Today there are 45,000 home economics teachers in programs enrolling 3,884,724 students... 3,193,987 are secondary students; 30,075 are postsecondary students; and 660,662 are adults.[1] Students enrolled in high school programs have opportunities for learning parenting and child care skills as a part of family life education. In many instances, these learning experiences are centered around caring for children in a day-care setting where students can observe developmental processes and interpersonal relationships. Other areas included in high school home economics are nutrition, housing and clothing, home management and consumer decision-making skills.

In addition, there are high school and postsecondary students enrolled in occupational courses designed to prepare for jobs as para-professionals in day care, as dietetic aides, homemaking aides, and institutional management aides. Adult programs offer opportunities for learning a variety of skills necessary for optimum use of time, and economic resources, as well as other family life skills.

We are convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the skills of these home economists in extension and education should, and will be, utilized at State and local levels where prime sponsors will be implementing child care and family service programs. We submit that this network of 48,000 professionals who work in extension and public education, in both rural and urban areas, possess unique skills for working with children and their families. Many are specialists in child development and family life who work in research and teaching to develop the knowledge base that is necessary to enable home economists to work more effectively with families. Others are more broadly prepared, but there is a core of concepts

[1] Preliminary Reports for Fiscal Year 1973, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education

common to all training and professional preparation of home economists. As a minimum, at the backelor's level, these 48,000 home economists will have studied general psychology, educational psychology, developmental and adolescent psychology, sociology, sociology of family, family relationships, and one to two courses in child development which includes the observation of young children. Supporting areas include studies in chemistry, physiology, biology, and nutrition.

I would also point out, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be an aura of acceptance for cooperative extension and for vocational home economics programs in the public schools. Over the years both programs have continued to grow and expand. Many people, particularly those adults who live in rural areas, have grown accustomed to going to Cooperative Extension workers for answers to their problems. This credibility is based on accessibility to people, back-up from knowledge and research that exists with specialists in the land grant colleges, and the ability of home economists to provide education in unstructured and informal settings, and to provide individualized learning experiences.

One dramatic example of this credibility can be found in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program implemented by Extension Home Economists. Of the 50 million families in the United States, more than five million have incomes below the poverty level. In 1968, the U.S. Department of Agriculture allocated $10 million to Cooperative Extension for a pilot program for reaching these low-income families with programs of nutrition education. The program was successful to the point that Congress has directly funded it at the level of $50 million. To date, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program has reached more than 1,076,882 families who are enrolled in intensive nutrition education programs. An additional 701,000 families have been identified and worked with at a less intensive level. Families are reached by program aides who are recruited and are continuously trained and supervised by extension home economists to teach adults. More than 22,000 aides have been employed since the program began. Through a one-to-one approach, aides knock on doors to locate homemakers; in other cases, neighbors or local agencies refer

them to homes. Their job--once they get past the front door--is to help homemakers improve their diets and those of family members.

Extension home economists, including specialists in nutrition, have developed many teaching tools to help aides in their work such as nutrition lesson plans, simple handout leaflets, and small flip charts. Once homemakers learn from the one-to-one teaching experience, aides then encourage them to join small groups. This program has reached low income families in rural and urban areas, on Indian reservations, and has reached concentrations of Mexican-American families who are isolated from the mainstream by poverty, culture, and language.

Almost as if in anticipation of the proposed legislation, in 1972 the Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, initiated a pilot program with these objectives:

. To design and test an informal continuing education program with family day care mothers.

. To insure that educational program and supportive services meet the needs of family day care mothers as they perceive them.

. To determine the roles that Cooperative Extension can play as trainer of indigenous family day care educators.

. To test the feasibility of Cooperative Extension in role of broker between family day care givers and those whose children need family day care.

. To explore the coordinating and leadership roles Cooperative Extension should play in linking with agencies responsible for comprehensive child care in a community.

The program has operated out of storefronts in Nassau County on Long Island, New York. This urban-suburban county with a population of 1.5 million has 236 licensed

family day care homes, but estimates place the number of unlicensed homes at many times that figure. The target area for the operation of the Family Day Care pilot program is in three contiguous villages which have a population of 77,000. This includes 27,336 children under age 18. Of these 7,000 are five years or younger. In Roosevelt where the storefront center is located, more than one-fourth of the population is receiving public assistance, mostly in the category of aid to dependent children. The percent of working mothers in the target area is estimated to exceed the national survey which reports that 4 out of every 10 mothers are working. Approximately 500 children in the target area are served in half and full-day liscensed arrangements which include Head Start, Pre-Kindergarten, BOCES Living Room School, and licensed family day care.

The Roosevelt project has consisted of a community based resource center for family day care parents to share ideas and experiences. Informal educational programs have been planned with family day care parents, including meetings, workshops, and trips to community resources. In addition, the storefront center has planned activities for children while family day care parents attend training. A monthly newsletter has been published to provide a communications link between family day care parents; teenage aides have been recruited to work with children in family day care homes; an advisory committee helps to determine program directions; and the center has also served as a "matchmaker" between parents seeking family day care and family day care providers. Many community agencies have cooperated in this pilot effort in family day care.

Feedback and evaluations on this program have been very positive. During the next year the program will expand to increase the number of family day care mothers; assistance will be provided to the Department of Social Service to organize groups of liscensed family day care mothers in other geographical areas in the county to involve them in continuing education programs now under way. During the current year there are plans to train an estimated 300 family day care mothers. Specialists working in the project will also include Department of Social Services staff in educational programs so that the mandated monthly home visits can be more meaningful to both the caseworkers and the family day care mothers.

Already there has been growth in the level of community awareness and support of family day care. The Cooperative Extension Family Day Care Program has had an impact on affecting these changes.

The capacity for outreach to families, the specialized knowledge that extension specialists and agents possess for helping children and their families will be a major resource for state and local prime sponsors in implementing the proposed child care and family services programs. We also see home economics departments in hundreds of high schools as having potential for contributing to child care and family services programs. Again, many of these now conduct day-care and kindergarten programs as an integral part of the instruction for high school students enrolled in family life and child development programs. Again, this is a resource that is available in both rural and urban areas--for strengthening and augmenting the delivery of services to children and their families.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, home economists not only support these two bills, H.R. 2966 and S. 626, but we feel that their comprehensive approach towards services to children and families tend to strengthen the concept of the importance of family to society. Hopefully, when implemented, these programs may reverse the fragmentation of family influence to which many present day ills are attributed. We also dedicate our considerable resources of organization and expertise in the field to the wise use of facilities and funds which will be made available upon enactment of the bills.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before these Subcommittees in behalf of the American Home Economics Association.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mrs. Jolly.

I take it, and I am only repeating what you say, when I state that you believe that this legislation would strengthen rather than weaken the American family?

Mrs. JOLLEY. Yes, indeed.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you.

The Chair will invite Ms. Marcosson to speak.

Ms. MARCOSSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Marilyn Marcosson. I am executive director of the American Parents Committee, Inc.

The American Parents Committee is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, public service organization working on behalf of Federal legislation for children.

Founded in 1947 by George J. Hecht, publisher of Parents Magazine, the APC was the first children's lobby, and I am pleased to note over that period of 27 years the establishment and growth of many children's lobbies as evidenced by the individuals and groups that have appeared before these two committees.

I doubt that many would deny the need for increased day care. But for the few who would question that need, and to remind those of us who believe in the program, I would like to present some statistics about the children and the amount of money their families earn.

These figures, although the most recent, are 2 years old, and for a forecast of current and future need, should be revised upward.

Out of all the children in America under 18—some 64.3 million—26.2 million had mothers in the work force. This included some 6 million children under the age of 6. To put this in more mundane terms, 6 million preschool children are in some type of child care arrangement. Mostly that means an aunt or a grandmother, or a neighbor lady looking after the preschooler. And what does that mean?

It probably means the little girl or boy is plopped in front of the TV for 8 or 10 hours in winter, and maybe in the summer that he or she is outside playing—either supervised or unsupervised.

It means no eye examinations or health tests, no nutritional guidance, no developmental play to ready the child for school, no identification of developmental disabilities whose progress might be arrested or even reversed, in any systematic way. That pattern is the reality for 5 million of the preschoolers who are not in licensed child care.

What about the 20 million children over 6 whose parents work? What happens to them? They are latchkey kids.

The Norman Rockwell picture of Mom waiting by the backdoor at 3 p.m., with a fresh baked pie and milk does not exist in America today.

Many of these children come home, let themselves in and then are on their own for the next 3 hours. What they do with that time is one of the unanswered questions of many mothers.

Of course, for many children and their parents, it is not only 3 hours to worry about, but more, when the children are on split session or in the lower grades that let out early.

The situation is even worse in those homes with only one parent. We have all heard of the increasing divorce rate in America, but what has not been understood is that the divorce rate has increased faster for

families with children than for those couples who were either childless or have children over 18.

Between 1960 and 1969, the number of children under 18 whose parents got divorced rose from 403,000 to 840,000, or more than 100 percent.

It should also be noted that labor force participation for divorced women was higher than in any other marital category. Nearly 50 percent of all divorced or separated women with children under 6 were working.

In fact, among all mothers with children under age 3, one out of five was working fulltime, full year in 1972. This was an increase of 5 percentage points over 1969, and it is, I believe, a valid assumption that in the 3 years since then, at least another 5 percent have joined the labor force. Thus, the figures for this year will probably show that one out of every four mothers with children under the age of 3 is working.

And what are these mothers doing with their kids?

They are hunting or looking. They are hunting for a child care center or a group home. And if they cannot find one that does not have a 2-year waiting list, or one where their income does not disqualify them, or that is not too expensive, they look for some neighborhood lady or a reliable teenager to look after their children.

And if they cannot find that, what do they do?

Unfortunately, many thousands of children are in what has been called unknown arrangements. That means either self-care with the mother phoning home every now and again during the workday, or the mother is taking the child to work with her.

But largely the current state of child care in America means parents, and especially mothers, worry about their children.

Hopefully, some of those statistics and the reality that surrounds them can convince some of the doubting Thomases and even the doubting Jerrys about the necessity of child care legislation.

Now, I would like to address myself to the particular legislation before these committees.

I would like to commend these committees for their efforts in the past and these current hearings.

I would like to especially congratulate you for holding these joint hearings. I believe that it will save time, money, and energy because we all know that on issues like this, the same witnesses troop from the House to the Senate saying the same things. Maybe this can speed up the process.

First: It is my belief the single most unfortunate aspect of S. 626 and H.R. 2966 is the low amount of money authorized. I believe this to be true for a number of reasons.

First, it will not meet even the lowest estimate of those who need child care.

Second, as Senator Mondale said, in the first go-round of these hearings, human services, on average receive only 30 to 40 percent of the amount authorized.

I have no reason to believe, based on past history and experience, that if you come in with a low authorization, child care will fare any better than that 30- to 40-percent figure.

Third, I believe that the 94th Congress will see the need for expanded child care and approve a higher amount.

In 1971, both Houses of Congress approved $2.5 billion in a 2-year program. No one can reasonably argue that the need has lessened. Nor can anyone argue that the purchasing power of those 1971 dollars has increased.

I must also admit, in all candor, that I find it difficult to believe that the 94th Congress would buy the arguments of a 1971 veto message of ex-President Nixon.

It cannot be argued that the money is not readily spendable. Every field investigator, every day care center operator in the country, every professional organization has stated, with additional money, more children could be taken into centers immediately.

It is for precisely those reasons that I also question the provisions of S. 626 and H.R. 2966, which provide no program money in the first year of the authorization.

The trained people are there. Many of them are unemployed now and could immediately be put to work.

Second: The American Parents Committee is unalterably opposed to the provisions of funds to for-profit operators. If you believe in parent participation in the decisionmaking process, and that is a firm belief of the APC, then you cannot logically allow for-profit centers.

The idea of profitmakers is, by definition, to maximixe profits. It is all too easy to imagine the situation developing where the parent council would like to hire additional staff or purchase additional equipment, and the for-profit operator trying to stop that process because it would cut into his profits.

I believe that it is only logical to assume that you cannot have high quality, high parent participation day care in a for-profit center.

Third: On the question of prime sponsorship, it is the position of the American Parents Committee that there should be no presumed prime sponsor. In some instances, the local government may be operating or funding programs that adequately meet the needs of the children and their parents.

In other cases, the local public school may be the best institution to deliver services.

I remember, as some of the more senior members of these committees can, the battle in 1971 over prime sponsors. In that case, it was a question of numbers, how large or small a grouping would be considered eligible for prime sponsorship.

It was the policy of the APC then, and it remains so now, that if local governments are the presumed prime sponsors, that the smallest size governments be eligible to run their own local programs, so we can maintain local flavor. Rural programs can run their own programs, and in urban areas the local neighborhood can participate in the program itself.

It is also my hope that the committees and the interest groups will not make their differences so intractable as to impede the passage of this legislation.

Fourth: The APC believes that low quality child care may, in some instances, be worse than no child care at all.

Therefore, we believe that at the minimum the same standards in force in the Head Start program should be enforced in these programs. It is commendable that the two bills have a 5-percent setaside for enforcement and monitoring.

Fifth: It is our belief that the income eligibility ought not to be set at the BLS lower living standard figure, but rather the figure used as the outside limit in title XX, social services legislation. That is 115 percent of the median income for a family of four, adjusted for family size, in each State.

The social services program was designed to meet the needs of families to insure that they did not go on the welfare rolls and to help those currently on the rolls go off. The child care program can do no less.

It also, I might add, would allow State differentiation. You often come across the problem of setting one standard for across the Nation. The difference in income in Mississippi and New York is so large that it is very difficult to find one national figure that would satisfy lower living costs or high living costs, or anything like that. So the State median income figure provides adjusted figures that might be more equitable all around.

While there are other aspects of the legislation that I could comment on, I will limit my remarks to those I have raised already.

In conclusion the APC believes that this is, overall, good legislation but needs specific improvements.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

We are happy to see the last sentence in your statement, and we accept the criticisms which you have offered to this legislation, which will be helpful to this committee, this joint committee, both the House and Senate committees, in writing legislation.

The Chair will now invite Mrs. Herndon to make her statement.

Mrs. HERNDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and committee members.

I am representing the National Congress of Parents and Teachers—popularly known as the National PTA, as you know. It is an organization of 7½ million members from every State, the District of Columbia, and the European Congress of American Parents, Teachers, and Students.

In 1949, Harry and Bonaro Overstreet made a study of the PTA and its influence on education and social growth in the United States. They titled their book, "Where Children Come First."

The Overstreets wrote, "We believe that what the National Congress of Parents and Teachers has been doing is the sort of thing that must be done by more groups if our culture is to maintain its integrity."

The words of the Overstreets still describe the purpose of PTA. Children and their welfare are our prime concern. Strengthening family life, in our belief, is one of the surest ways of promoting and protecting the welfare of children.

Therefore, the National PTA has adopted as one of its five primary items in its 1974–75 legislative program the enactment of legislation to strengthen family services and to provide quality services to young children in families that have insufficient resources to provide for their children's health, nutritional, and educational needs. The bills now under consideration—H.R. 2966 and S. 626—would, we believe, provide the resources so desperately needed by many families.

Federal support for State and local family service programs—including prenatal care, in-home tutoring, part- and full-time day care, nutrition and health services, and after school care—would serve as a source of aid to families with inadequate abilities to meet, either technically or financially, their aspirations for their children.

This is a corollary of the scientific research of the past decade that has emphasized the importance of children's early years in terms of both mental health and learning, and has underscored an increasing national concern for the effort of the home environment on the learning process.

The need for increased child and family services has been well documented.

Let us simply point out that, according to the U.S. Census, the number of children in nursery schools has doubled in the last 10 years. We are aware, too, that in 1974 there were only a million day care openings for 6 million children.

Congresswoman Chisholm spoke earlier this morning to a point I would also like to mention at this time. We believe in a time of economic crunch which, unfortunately, we must believe will be with us for some time, we can expect the number of working mothers to increase as they seek to supplement the family income or become the sole support of their families.

Nor can we expect the number of single-parent families to decrease. Rather, their numbers will increase.

During periods of stress, the strains on family life are also heightened. Thus, the need for the supplemental services provided to the family in the proposed legislation in the areas of counseling, health, nutrition, et cetera, are greater than ever.

Our testimony today shall not attempt to present a title-by-title analysis of the bills. Having stated our support for the need for additional day care and preschool programs, as well as other services to families, we offer the following additional comments:

One: We believe that the family is still the most fundamental influence on the child and providing services to strengthen family life is, therefore, of paramount importance.

Two: We support wholeheartedly the fact that this is a program of voluntary participation. PTA shall make every effort to inform its members and the public in general that there is nothing in the child and family services bills that would mandate participation on the part of any parent or child. No parent need have a child in this program unless the parent so desires.

Three: We support also the fact that the bills address themselves to the broader concept of child development, rather than simply to day care. We would assume that under this concept of total child development, mental health services would also be provided.

Four: We would urge that the program be available to accommodate people who have no other possibilities for such services. While we recognize the need to give assistance to working mothers and those with the greatest economic need, there are often human needs that transcend economic considerations. Provision for participation on the part of such families should also be provided.

Five: PTA believes that parent involvement and parent education are absolutely vital in any effort or program to strengthen family life. We note, with approval, the attention given to this concept in the proposed legislation and we would oppose any amendment to weaken parent participation and provisions for parent education.

Six: In addition to direct health benefits, we believe there are larger implications for health care implicit in the proposed legislation. For example, earlier identification of handicapped children would be possible and nutrition benefits for mothers and their children would come at an earlier stage in the development of a child.

Seven: We approve the requirement that no child can be the subject of research and experimentation without parental approval. Here, too, the voluntary nature of participation is clearly stated. We would oppose any amendment to modify this provision.

Eight: We endorse the provisions that stress the family as a unit—as in family counseling for parents and children. In a highly mobile and rapidly changing society, the need for family counseling can be expected to increase.

Nine: PTA believes that prime sponsors must be either State or local governmental agencies where there is greater public control and, consequently, greater accountability. National PTA policy requires that public funds for the education of children and youth, and for health and welfare services for children and youth, must be channeled through public boards or departments, or, at the very least, through nonprofit organizations.

Ten: To guarantee the best possible delivery of the new services promised in the bills now under consideration, the prime sponsor should not be limited to one particular governmental agency as, for example, the public schools. We would comment further that where schools are able, and willing to take on such increased responsibility, they could very well be so designated.

Eleven: As the bills appear to satisfy PTA's objection that profitmaking organizations may not be prime sponsors, PTA would accept the utilization by prime sponsors of profitmaking organizations to operate programs, provided that the costs and standards for service are fully met and fully enforced. No program, whether operated by profit or nonprofit groups, should be exempt from the requirement of full parent involvement and participation, including parent education.

National PTA stands ready to provide for the committees additional information as required. We compliment the sponsors of the bills for their recognition of the need for such legislation.

We are appreciative of being heard here today.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mrs. Herndon.

We invited Ms. Friedman to present her statement.

Ms. FRIEDMAN. On behalf of the Day Care Council and its executive director, Theodore Taylor, who I am sorry to say is unable to be here today, I would like to congratulate the chairman of this committee and the committee members themselves for their efforts on behalf of children. We hope that the rest of Congress and the administration will be as enthusiastic and supportive of the Child and Family Services Act as are child care advocates.

Mr. Taylor wanted the committee to be aware that since the time of the introduction of the Child and Family Services Act of 1974, the council has been sending recommendations for hearing sites to Senator Mondale and his staff. In order to know what effects this piece of legislation will have when implemented, it is necessary that you

become familiar with programs, problems, and needs in a variety of settings. In order for the views of a diverse population to be sufficiently represented, we would like to hear a commitment from the committee that the hearings similar to the one here today will be held in rural areas, cities, and counties across the country.

Perhaps alternative arrangements could be made to provide transportation for people to come to Washington. The council is more than willing to help organize any such efforts.

The council has been soliciting comments and criticisms from its grassroots constituency through conference workshops and local membership meetings. This testimony, then, is the testimony of those people who work with and for children on a day-to-day basis.

Comprehensive child care legislation must include all aspects of child development within the context of a variety of child care program forms, not just day care centers. The council is concerned about family day care homes, which provide an estimated 1 to 2 million unlicensed spaces. If a State is licensing only a small number of its family day care homes, then it is failing to protect all of its children equally.

We recommend that a study of the licensing and regulating alternatives for family day care homes be mandated in the bill, as well as a means for enforcing and monitoring licensing statutes. The council is willing to provide the committee with research that has been done in the area.

The council feels that the $1.85 billion authorization is not sufficient to develop the kinds of programs needed and recommended by the bill.

We feel that operating funds should be available during the first year and that the broader training component and additional $175 million provided for in the House bill be adopted.

A fee scale should be required, but developed at the local level to allow for the diversity in the cost of living.

In spite of the economy and the President's pledge to veto new Federal spending programs, and based on the scope of the unmet needs, and the extent to which child care creates jobs and helps the unemployment picture, we recommend a larger funding level than what is presently authorized.

The delivery mechanism must provide for alternatives and build upon existing systems. The competencies needed to be a prime sponsor should be more clearly defined, and, above all, a prime sponsor should be a representative for the community it will be serving.

As far as the State is concerned, people are weary of its commitment due to the small amount of revenue-sharing money spent on social services, and the recent HEW audit, disclosing violations of regulations, mismanagement of funds, and payment for services not delivered. Citizens are beginning to realize how hard it is to provide competent services when you are part of an incompetent system.

As for the profit-making child care operations, we feel that quality is the issue. We recommend that a parent have the option of placing his or her child in a for-profit center and be entitled to Federal subsidy, if that center is providing quality care.

Third, the public school issue. We recommend that a school, meeting the requirements may become a project applicant, and where appropriate, a prime sponsor.

However, we cannot accept that the schools be given the exclusive responsibility for a system in which they have played such a very little role, though they have had the opportunity to do so in after-school and before-school programs all these years.

We need the help of a variety of organizations and agencies, yet we must first look to see how involved these agencies are; how strong their commitment is. This may only be tested by deed; not by rhetoric.

We believe that parent involvement enhances the quality of a child care program. We recommend that the percentage of parents on the child and family services councils and local policy councils be flexible enough to allow for input from experienced parents and others participating to the ongoing operation of the program.

In the case of foster children and runaway youths, programs are established because there are no parents. The 50-percent parent participation requirement should be reexamined in such cases.

We concur with the provision that 10 percent of the funds be used for handicapped children's programs, but recommend that that money be used only for special operating costs specific to handicapped children's needs.

We recommend that the definition of children be extended to age 18 to allow for continuity of funding for handicapped children who may then use social security benefits.

We support the provision in the House bill for the mortgage and insurance fund for child care facilities. Building costs are expensive for those with little, if any, startup funds available to them.

Judging by the questions asked by the committee members in previous testimony and those in the audience wearing "No to Family Service" buttons, there is still one question left to be answered by people supporting child care: Is child care a good or bad thing for families and children? If we look at the economic picture, many families do not have a choice as to whether day care is good or not. They must work, make money for their family's survival, and have someone look after their children while they do so. The Child and Family Services Act is geared toward the people who do not have a choice, while the issue of whether child care is good or bad comes from families that do.

The Child and Family Services Act will not solve all problems facing the family today, but it is a step in the right direction. Opposition to this legislation is clearly opposition to a stable, self-reliant way of life for millions of American families.

We hail the Child and Family Services Act as a step forward for our Nation's children. The members, board, and staff of the council are prepared to work with you and other concerned groups on a continuing basis to maximize the potential of this vitally needed child care legislation.

At this time I would like permission to submit for inclusion in the record the prepared testimony Mr. Taylor had hoped to present at this hearing today.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you. It shall be made a part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Taylor follows:]

TESTIMONY OF THEODORE TAYLOR
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DAY CARE AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT
COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.

ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT
(H.R. 2966, S 626)

TO THE JOINT HEARING OF THE HOUSE SELECT
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, THE SENATE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH,
AND THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND
MIGRATORY LABOR

MARCH 13, 1975

Chairman Brademas, Chairman Mondale, and Members of the Committee, I thank you for the opportunity to represent the views of an organization deeply committed to the care of our nation's children. The Day Care and Child Development Council of America is a grassroots organization providing information and technical assistance to a large child care constituency. We represent people at the local level -- day care center directors struggling to keep their programs alive; teachers and aides in need of training and educational tools; parents who both need and want child care services; family day care mothers; consultants; professionals; department of welfare staff; etc. For the past year we have been holding workshops on the Child and Family Services Act and familiarizing people with the specific provisions of the legislation. We have solicited their ideas, comments, and criticisms. This testimony, then, is the testimony of our constituents - those who work with and for children on a day to day basis.

COMPREHENSIVENESS

"Comprehensive" should include all components of a child care program, all children within a given area, and all resources required to meet the needs. Given the funding level of the bill, it is clear that we are not really talking about "comprehensive" child care. We can, however, talk about effective child care legislation that must include all aspects of child development, e.g. health, nutrition, education, emotional and intellectual stimulation, adult-child interaction, to name only a few, within the context of a variety of child care program settings. An adequate bill must address the need for diversity of program forms - not just day care centers. It is constantly repeated that only one million spaces are available for 6 million preschool children whose mothers work. However, family day care homes provide an estimated 1-2 million additional spaces and have yet to receive the attention they deserve. Only 10% of all family day care homes are

licensed which is why the figures are not included in the one million space availability figure. According to the Westat survey, a minimum of 837,000 children are cared for in family day care homes, and another 150,000 cared for during summer months. Ninety-eight percent of the family day care homes caring for these 987,000 are not licensed. Very often, family day care homes are established on an informal basis by neighbors in the area. The women feel that state and federal regulations are an invasion of privacy. Others view the standards as impractical and outdated; some do not know about the law; the formality of the red tape and certificates appear intrusive into what they see as their natural right to do what they wish in their own homes; parents will use the service whether or not it is licensed, there seems no compelling reason to be licensed; and they have observed little or no enforcement of the licensing statutes that do exist. All children, in every type of care, deserve to be treated equally. If the state is licensing only a small number of its family day care homes, it is failing to protect all its children equally. We encourage the building of family day care systems which can guarantee adequate training and support for family day care providers. We recommend that a study of the licensing and regulating alternatives for family day care homes be mandated within the bill and recommendations made when examining the methods for monitoring and enforcing child care standards. We would be more than willing to provide the Committee with research that has already been done in this area.

FUNDING

The Council feels that the $1.85 billion authorization is not sufficient to develop the kinds of programs needed and recommended by the bill. It is conceivable that there will be at least two prime sponsors per state, a minimum of 100 prime sponsors. To what extent can $350 million be used for developing training programs, and planning projects among 100 groups who must then share the wealth with their project applicants?

It is also felt that it is unrealistic to provide money only for training and planning during the first year, when the very programs they are planning to expand or maintain, are dying, due to lack of funds. This is not to undermine the importance of training. The quality of the staff is one of the most significant factors assuring a quality program. For this purpose, we highly recommend inclusion of the broader training component in the House version of the bill, and the additional $175 million over and above the $1.85 billion authorization.

We support the need for a sliding fee scale for families with incomes above the Bureau of Labor Statistics Standards. The cut-off point may have to be changed to coincide with Title XX legislation. We feel, however, that the fee scale should be determined at the state or local level, to allow for diversity in the cost of living. By lowering the limit of those who can receive free child care, the amount needed to fund the program will also be reduced, and community members will have to absorb much of the cost. The possible compromise for the House and Senate versions of the bill would be for a fee schedule to be required but be developed at the community level and approved by the Office of Child and Family Services.

In addressing the present state of the economy, and the President's pledge to put a one year moratorium on new federal spending programs, we feel that child care is a worthwhile investment in jobs. Unavailability of child care was the only factor preventing 2500 adult AFDC recipients from participating in the WIN program as of December 31, 1973, according to the National Center for Social Statistics, HEW. The State of Texas, for instance, had 541 mothers who could not participate, involving 1400 children. These women are probably unemployment statistics today. In addition, the creation of child care services, homes, centers, or training programs, also creates jobs. Therefore, in spite of the economy and the President's pledge, and based on the scope of the unmet needs and the extent to which child care can help the unemployment situation, we recommend a larger funding level than what is presently authorized.

DELIVERY SYSTEM

Delivery systems for human service programs have been a most controversial and unprogressive area. The lack of a confined body of knowledge or technology relating services to needs is a major reason for this. As a result, program concerns lose way to political considerations, and the power of the body politic becomes the controlling force. A perfect example of this is how revenue sharing monies are distributed.

There is no one solution to the problem of delivery systems. For this reason, the delivery mechanism must provide for alternatives and build upon existing systems. There must be language in the bill that defines specific capabilities and competencies required for a prime sponsor. Above all, a prime sponsor should be a representative for the community it will be serving.

As far as the state is concerned, people at the local level need a commitment from the state if the state is to assume responsibility for delivering child care

services. Less than 3% of revenue sharing monies were spent on educational programs, and less than 1% of that for preschool education. Much will be told when we see how states begin interpreting the Title XX legislation. The potential of that law and the extent to which more people will be eligible for more services and have access to the full $2.5 billion allocated for social services, is to a large degree up to the states.

We must also look to the states to see that there is not a repeat of results from the recent HEW audits. A two-year federal audit of day care programs in 9 states showed violations of state licensing regulations, poor accounting techniques, and mismanagement of funds. Some of the states reviewed were found to have paid for more services than were actually delivered. It is not true that we cannot afford child care. It is, however, clear that we cannot afford poor quality child care. In addition, less emphasis should be placed on the incompetency of the provider, and more on the incompetency of the system, of which the provider is a part.

Another area of concern has been the for-profit operations in the field of child care. I have seen proprietary centers with quality staff, good food services, and a sound educational component. I have also seen many for-profit programs that are not providing adequate services. On the other hand, I have seen both good and bad nonprofit programs. Once again, we turn to the need for enforcement of good standards. Above all, quality is the issue. We recommend that a parent should have the option of placing his/her child in a for-profit center and be entitled to federal subsidy for that child, if that center is providing quality care.

Thirdly, we come to the public school issue. In light of the need for this bill to be a truly comprehensive effort, we feel that it is unacceptable for the public schools to consider themselves as an exclusive prime sponsor of child care services across the country. We are aware that as a result of the decrease in school enrollment, there are many empty classrooms and unemployed teachers. Both the facilities and the teachers could be used to help provide child care services. But, it is not necessary, nor does it follow, that they should assume the responsibility of all programs. Child care people have worked hard for the last 20-30 years developing knowledge and experience in how to provide a <u>family-support</u> service, - knowledge and experience which the public schools obviously do not have. In fact, in a statement of the American Federation of Teachers, the first recommendation for improving the bill was to delete the work "family," and I quote, "nor attempt

to provide such services." We recommend that any school district that meets the criteria established by the prime sponsor, consistent with the legislation, may take on an early childhood education program as a project applicant. In some areas, where appropriate, they may be prime sponsors. We cannot, however, accept that the schools be given the exclusive responsibility for a system in which they have played such a very little role, though they have had the opportunity to do so in after-school and before-school programs all these years.

Because the need is so great, we naturally welcome organizations that can help provide these vitally needed services to children and their families. Yet we must first look to see how involved these agencies are; how strong their commitment is. This may only be tested by deed; not by rhetoric.

At a Leadership Action Conference, December, 1974, convened by the Council and attended by leaders and directors of child care programs from across the country, a report was made on the basic elements of a good delivery system. I would like to outline the major points for you:

A delivery system must:

1. be universally available
2. build upon the network of already existing services
3. be designed to meet the needs of families and children rather than focus on the system
4. include a standard-setting process which includes input from providers and consumers
5. be delivered nationally in a way flexible enough to allow for alternatives for implementation at the local level which must include:
    a) planning capacity with the ability to assess needs and available resources
    b) decision-making as close to the provider of care as possible
    c) involvement in decision-making process by local constituents (community and parents)
    d) access to alternatives for program forms and administrative auspices
    e) support for parents and providers which will insure quality of care for children, such as:
        1 - ongoing training and technical assistance to meet standards
        2 - information and referral system
        3 - linkages to major existing networks of services in the community
        4 - ongoing monitoring and evaluation at all levels which provide for an appeal process at all levels.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The Council strongly believes that informed parents, who participate in the decision-making process of a child care program, significantly contribute to the quality of that program. We feel that the percentage of parents on the Child and Family Services Councils should be flexible enough to allow for the input of parents who have already had their children go through a similar program and to allow for the input of all those who might be contributing to the functioning of the programs, i.e., teachers, directors, fire marshalls, health inspectors, department of welfare representatives, etc. It is important that those who are indirectly working together have an opportunity to be directly involved with one another.

If this bill addresses the needs of foster children and runaway youths, the parent participation requirement will be difficult to meet. If the programs exist because there are no parents, then the 50% Child and Family Services Council and Local Policy Council requirements should be reevaluated.

HANDICAPPED

We concur with the provision that 10% of the funds should go for handicapped programs, however, we recommend that that 10% be designated only for special operating costs for handicapped children, e.g., equipment, therapists, etc. All basic operating costs should be allocated on the same basis as other child care programs.

In addition, we recommend a further investigation of the EPSDT program and why and how it has been so underutilized and not incorporated into child care programs in the past.

OFFICE OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

We recommend that the Office of Child and Family Services, which will replace the Office of Child Development, should have the responsibility for coordinating all federal programs, except those specific to public education, in addition to administering the Child and Family Services Act. The Child and Family Services Coordinating Council should be specifically responsible to such programs as the Community Development grants in HUD, the Indian Education program in the Department of Interior, the AFDC and WIN studies conducted by the Department of Labor, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, the nutrition programs available through the Department of Agriculture, the handicapped programs in the Office of Education, and the health programs in HEW, to name a few, in addition to those mentioned under Section 101(b) of the bills.

DEFINITION OF CHILDREN

We would like to recommend that you extend the definition of "children" to include those children up to age 18, as opposed to age 15, to allow for continuity of funding for handicapped children who may then apply for social security benefits at age 18.

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY DAY CARE REQUIREMENTS

We strongly support the provision for the revision of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. We feel that these standards are outdated and should be looked at in light of current research in the field of child development and the more progressive programs in existence today. We feel that such standards should not be legislated, so that they may be easily reassessed and redefined if need be.

MORTGAGE FUND

We support the provision in the House bill for the mortgage and insurance fund for child care facilities. Building costs and mortgages are astronomical expenses for those with little, if any, start-up funds available to them.

CONCLUSION

Judging by the questions asked by the committee members in previous testimony and those in the audience wearing "No to Family Service" buttons, there is still one question left to be answered by people supporting child care: Is child care a good or bad thing for families and children? If we look at the economic picture, many families do not have a choice as to whether day care is good or not. They must work, make money for their family's survival, and have someone look after their children while they do so. The Child and Family Services Act is geared toward people who do not have a choice, while the issue of whether child care is good or bad comes from families who do have a choice.

Any leadership role on the part of the federal government that provides resources and ideological stimulus from which new systems will grow to support the American family is a good thing. This bill will not solve all problems facing the family today, but it is a step in the right direction. Opposition to this legislation is clearly opposition to a stable, self-reliant way of life for millions of American families.

We hail the Child and Family Services Act as a step forward for our nation's children. The members, Board, and staff of the Council are prepared to work with you and other concerned groups on a continuing basis to maximize the potential of this vitally needed child care legislation.

Senator STAFFORD. The Chair will remind the committee and the witnesses that their full statements will be put in the record.

The Chair invites Dr. Janet Heddesheimer to speak and then we will come back for questions.

Ms. HEDDESHEIMER. Thank you very much, Senator Stafford and Congresswoman Chisholm.

I am Janet Heddesheimer, assistant professor of education at George Washington University and a member of the Government relations committee of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. It is the association that I am representing here today as I testify before you.

It is with pleasure that I testify before this Joint House and Senate Subcommittee on the Child and Family Services Act of 1975.

The association is very much in support of the legislation.

You do have my full testimony. I would like to summarize what I view as the strengths of the bill and also suggest possible additions to the bill, which I believe would make the bill even more responsive to the needs of the children and families it has designed to serve.

In terms of strengths there are several areas that we feel are especially important and commendable.

First of all: The emphasis on prevention is critical. It is very important to identify possible areas of difficulty, such as potential learning problems, psychological problems, physical handicaps, and so forth, long before children reach elementary school. Hopefully through early identification we can work toward ameliorating some of these difficulties in order that they do not become severe problems later on for the child.

Second: I note in the bill that there is an emphasis on all phases of the child's development. Again as an educator and counselor, I support that. It is very important to attend to the emotional, physical, social, and intellectual development of the child. All four work in tandem.

Third: You have heard a number of witnesses today speak about the importance of parental involvement. I would only second the comments they have made. Unless the parents feel they have a role, they will not be committed to child care programs. To work with a child outside of the home is not enough to ameliorate difficulties or to assist in the child's development. We must have, in addition, parents working with children in the home to support and reinforce what is happening in the day-care center.

Fourth: The training component is an excellent one. Staff, both paraprofessional and professional, need assistance in knowing how to offer services beyond physical care.

In terms of changes or modifications we would like to see, I would like to mention several. As I have heard witnesses today and as you have heard them, you have noticed a number of them have spoken of the need for counseling and consultation for the family and parents. We feel you should strengthen the area which discusses the need for parent consultation and services.

I have found myself in my own work as well as in talking to other people who have been involved with young children and their parents, that the parents often need and request information and assistance in knowing how to work with their children. This can be done effectively, either individually or in groups.

Just one example of such a program is that run by Mr. Ronald J. Schmerber of the Schaumburg, Early Education Center in Illinois. This is a center that works with 3- and 4-year-old children.

I have with me today an article from the Elementary School Guidance and Counseling Journal which discusses the parent program in Schaumburg, Ill.

I would like with your permission to ask that the article be included in addition to my comments.

Senator STAFFORD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The article referred to follows:]

Ms. HEDDESHEIMER. We also feel that counselors can play a very important role in terms of training paraprofessionals. It is critical that professionals and paraprofessionals be able to deal with such things as a healthy psychological environment for the child.

Finally, I would like to suggest that certainly by the time children are 3 and 4 years old they can profit from some developmental guidance programs for themselves. Again I refer to the program that is being run in Schaumburg, Ill. There are a number of programs already provided for young children.

In conclusion I would like to encourage you to strengthen provisions for counseling services in S. 626 and H.R. 2966. I think it would be tragic if we missed an opportunity to assist children with potential learning problems before the problems become more severe and also if we missed an opportunity to assist parents in working with their own children.

Thank you, Senator. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

The Chair thanks all the members of the panel.

Mrs. Chisholm, do you have questions?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I do. Thank you very much.

I would first like to ask the question of Ms. Marcosson. First of all I want to compliment you on the very down-to-Earth statement.

One question arose in my mind. That is, your organization, or even you, personally, would agree to Federal guidelines pertaining to basic standards for all child-care services, but you would not agree to any kind of Federal guidelines with respect to fee setting, but would leave that up to the region?

Ms. MARCOSSON. I think that is correct. We would insist upon minimally acceptable Federal standards on such things as staff ratios and other kinds of program standards.

Clearly, to try to set any kind of fee schedule, nationally, which HEW is trying to do on title 20 regulation is going to be very, very difficult. You can do it in a variety of ways: percentage of family income or flat fee for services, but clearly each of those has advantages and disadvantages that are regionally and economically differentiated.

I think to try to set national standards on fees is going to create more problems than it will solve.

If you look at those figures on median income by States in title 20 there is a great disparity between these figures. I think we should leave it to what the local people can bear best.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Herndon, on page 3 of your statement you indicate that the prime sponsor should not be limited to one particular governmental agency, as for example the public schools. There is a great deal of discussion with respect to public schools moving into this area. Of course one of the arguments that is raised in regard to public schools is they are tied to the property tax base and you also know that this tax base discriminates invidiously against poor neighborhoods in the country.

Therefore, I think it would be very disastrous to find day care centers placed in that kind of position as to whether or not there will be enough funds to take care of child care centers.

In addition to the fact that we look at the whole child care area as an area that involves the total family concept. We know that there are statutory and contractual limitations with respect to public school systems regarding the visits of teachers to the homes of children, and so forth.

Now, I see that you are actually in conflict, I guess with many of the public school individuals, and you do represent the National PTA. I am very much interested in your pursuing that point a little bit.

Mrs. HERNDON. I believe we are saying that it should not be limited to any one organization, and we simply cite public schools here as an example. If there is a public school in a given area that is able and willing to take on such increased responsibility, then perhaps it could be designated a prime sponsor. We are not saying, specifically, that a public school should not be so designated, Congresswoman Chisholm. If there is a public school functioning as a community school center, it may already be providing different programs for many members of the family. Community school education is based on a family concept where many opportunities and services are available to the whole family. In some areas, where community school centers are available, they may wish to be designated as prime sponsors.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

I would like for anyone on the panel to answer this.

In view of what has happened in many of the public school situations in our country and a necessity for the kind of individualized, specialized care involving the total family, the counseling of parents, guidance of parents, local decisionmaking on the part of the parents, do you really feel that the public school will be able to become involved in all of these areas which have been really partially an important part of the day-care centers as they have been operating?

The only reason I raise this question with the entire panel is because the public schools in several sections of the Nation have failed many children in their early years. We are concerned about individualized care and health, safety and welfare of children during the first 6 years which are very important. We are just wondering whether or not the public school is really able to take on this added responsibility, because we are not talking about children alone. We are talking about the concept of total family unit.

I would be interested in some of the reactions from other members on the panel if you care to elaborate.

Mrs. HERNDON. May I say one other thing, please. It is not our intent to say that these programs should be a part of the public school at all. We are saying if there is a school that is willing and able to do it, perhaps the public school should be the prime sponsor. We are not saying that schools must take on prime sponsorship.

Ms. MARCOSSON. Clearly the public schools have failed in many aspects. The Children's Defense Fund study that was done recently, found 2 million school-age children were not in school because of handicaps and because of emotional difficulties or because of illegal suspensions. Clearly if there are 2 million what we currently call school-age children who are not in school, what is going to happen when they get another 30 million eligible children or 20 million eligible children?

I am not sure that schools in some cases—I agree with the PTA position on this—cannot in some small communities, say, might be an appropriate vehicle. In rural areas it might be the kind of place where a small community would best be served by having a program in the school. In fact that may be where the headstart program is now running.

Now, in other communities perhaps we might make it on a population basis. In larger communities I think the record is too clear about the failure of public schools.

I am a believer in public schools, I am a product of public schools all the way through college. I am very supportive of them. But I think we have evidenced a great deal of problems in the last few years.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. The reason I am pursuing this is because I do not think we should forget what the purpose of the day-care program is. We must remember that we are concerned about all the component parts in the day-care situation—the mother, father, the family unit and the child, and all of the accessory guidance and counseling and benefits that go to the benefit of the total family unit, in helping to make that family unit a stronger one.

The failure of the public schools on many of these levels, particularly in our large cities, concerns me. Might it not be detrimental to place such family services with schools that are not really able to take care of their problems with respect to children attending such schools? Should they now assume a greater responsibility in terms of the very youngest children in our society within their particular institution?

Ms. FRIEDMAN. I would like to respond to that.

I think one of the key issues in the bill and why it is so valuable to children and their families is that it provides a family support of children or at least recognizes the need for one. I do not think that is something that the public schools have thus far recognized.

The first recommendation made by the American Federation of Teachers is that the word "family" be deleted from the bill and no such services be included. In addition, one original purpose for the entire day care program was that transition from the home to the public schools. If you put them in public schools, I think you lose some of that purpose.

Mrs. JOLLEY. I comment that it seems important to me to preserve the diversity in the bill, and in places where day care could be provided in public schools it should be permissible under these bills. I was just in a school last week where there were 26 preschoolers being cared for in a public school setting, by teenaged adolescents. There was great parental involvement and support for that program. I think day care can occur in this type of setting, and where the bills allow for diversity, that we should preserve that option.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

I have one more question and then I will keep quiet, Mr. Chairman.

In the cooperative extension service, are you indicating that they should be encouraged to be the prime sponsors in the rural areas of this country where they are located?

Mrs. JOLLEY. No. I am not recommending that cooperative extension necessarily be a prime sponsor. I am simply saying that extension has a long tradition of working with families and is a resource for implementing child care services.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

Ms. HEDDESHEIMER. Excuse me, Mrs. Chisholm, but before you move on, with regard to the relationship of schools I would agree with Mrs. Jolley, that perhaps some schools are appropriate as prime sponsors and others are not. My concern is more that the work with day care centers be coordinated with the work done in schools. For example, when children are moving from day care centers at 5 or 6 into schools and if they are evidencing some learning difficulties, the schools should be made aware of the problems and be made aware of what the day care center has done to help the child and go on to build on that work.

Also in terms of in-service work, some of the in-service work done with staff in one setting might be applicable to a staff in another setting. Psychological services, some large city school systems have large psychological services, and I think we need to think in terms of coordination between the agencies rather than fragmentation.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much.

I will make one addendum.

Prior to becoming a legislator, my field was child care centers and nursery schools. I have been getting hundreds of letters on this bill, and it is very interesting that the letters can be divided into two areas, persons in large urban centers where the public schools have failed in certain ways are not happy about the fact that public schools should now be moving into this program for all the reasons that we do not have time to go into this morning.

And, secondly, from the rural areas or smaller areas many persons are feeling that perhaps the public school is the one place that should move into the area of being prime sponsors and of taking over programs because of space, etc.

It is very interesting in terms of the letters I am getting that there is this division based on certain sections of the country. I just wanted to say that.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mrs. Chisholm.

The Chair wants to note that we invite experts to testify in our hearings, and we have experts on the committee staff of both the House and the Senate, but we are in the unusual position today of having a resident sitting expert on the committee in the field we are going into, in Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Hall, do you have questions?

Mr. HALL. Well, I think I should say something maybe in defense of the public school system. I believe that on balance they have done pretty well.

I think that we have looked at the public schools probably because there has been no other place to go.

I am reminded in 1965 and 1966 when we thought that Headstart was the right direction, there was nothing available in the way of prekindergarten curriculum guides.

I think a lot of experiences I have had with the Headstart program—they have turned to nursery and kindergarten teachers, simply because they had no other place to go.

I think in defense of the public school system that on balance they have served us pretty well, and when you take them out of their traditional role of the three R's and ask them to do a lot of other things, I think they have met the challenge very well.

I have heard a great deal this morning about parent involvement, and I agree with that concept, but I can remember that as a classroom teacher, that when it did come the day to have parent-teacher conferences it was like pulling teeth on occasion to get the parents to show up.

I would like to know if anything has happened as of late, at least since I left the classroom, that would cause hope for improvement in this area?

How do you get parents involved? It is nice to say they should get involved, and they should have a voice. I agree with that. But I found from my experience that it was a difficult thing to get them involved.

If you have any new insight, or light to shed on this, I would like to hear it.

Mrs. HERNDON. I am not sure it is a new insight, Mr. Hall, but I believe today parents throughout the country are more eager to be involved than ever before in the history of our country.

I do not know how recent you were in the classroom, but I do think there is a strong trend now that only that—not only parents, but citizens want to be involved in education. I think it is incumbent upon us to be involved, and in programs like this it is incumbent upon the bills to provide that parents be involved, and the administration to provide that parents be involved, not only in planning, but in decisionmaking.

Before the decisions are made, the parents need to be heard about what is going to happen in many of the local programs.

I think parents are more eager to be involved today. I think this to be true as I traveled over the country, and talked with PTA groups throughout the Nation.

Ms. MARCOSSON. I would also like to comment.

One of the problems in the past has been that a lot of parent-teacher conferences have been scheduled when parents have been working. Many schools have half-day once a month, or half-day once every 2 months where the kids get off.

We just had an instance in my office where the kid forgot to tell his parents, one of my coworkers, that he was going to have a half day off, and so the kid was home by himself, and the parents were working. This often becomes the problem.

There has been a study done in San Francisco on what parents like to do to participate. Among the things they are saying, they would most like to do is to spend time with their children in the centers.

So I think that what we want to do, and what we want to encourage, is that parent involvement be done in the time and place when parents can in fact participate, that it be done in evenings or on weekends, perhaps.

I know this might put a strain on the contracts the public schools might have. That was the point Mrs. Chisholm raised. But I think if any kind of program is adopted perhaps report language can be noted that parental involvement should be at a time and place where the parents can actually do it without sacrificing a sick-leave day or a vacation day, or without having to lose pay to come and participate.

If it is a choice between losing pay or not meeting with the teachers in these economic times, the people are going to choose not to meet with the teacher, and stay on the job and work.

Mr. HALL. I must have been in a school way ahead of its time, because most of our parent-teacher conferences were in the evening, as they should be, I think.

Ms. MARCOSSON. I would like to commend you and the school district, but I do not know how uniform that policy is.

Mr. HALL. Thank you.

No other questions.

Senator STAFFORD. The Chair wants to amend its previous statement, and note that we have two resident experts.

Mr. Pressler?

Mr. PRESSLER. I want to ask a very brief question. It concerns a question that is directly related to my constituency.

I come from a rural part of the country, and I have three Indian reservations in my district. Mostly when I go home on weekends, almost every weekend, I go from 1 small town of 400 people to another, and frequently these towns do not have schools. Children ride up in buses for up to an hour each way sometimes.

I am wondering, I am a supporter of the program, and indeed, a cosponsor, how this program will realistically reach those people in those rural areas of Indian reservations and small towns.

Ms. MARCOSSON. Mr. Pressler, I think it ought to be understood that this bill is not simply for group day care. One of the things in this bill, one of the things which perhaps ought to be emphasized more is family day care.

These are provisions wherein groups of less than 12 is usually the standard definition, groups come together generally in somebody's home to participate.

I think the emphasis of this legislation would encourage that type of program. And that perhaps could take care of the small community where they have five or six preschoolers in the same age in the whole town.

I think family day care may be the answer for that. The parents also have to commute an hour or so.

Mr. PRESSLER. No further questions.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Pressler.

This Senator comes from a rather rural State, too. We sometimes think that a metropolis is a place with 3,000 people. We note that Mrs. Jolley is here repesenting the American Home Economics Association.

Would you have any comment, since many of the people you represent work in rural areas, we would invite a comment from you.

Mrs. JOLLEY. Yes, Senator Stafford.

I think the Cooperative Extension Service, as I have tried to point out, is so accessible to people, it is in more than 3,000 communities of this Nation, and extension personnel have a capacity for outreach, and for organizing rural people that is unique, I think.

I myself am a graduate of a "Head Start program." I should not say how many years ago, in my own school where in a very rural area of northwest Alabama, there was organized a class of preschool youngsters who were given, in effect, day care.

There is a history and a tradition of outreach of working with families, with home economics personnel, both in extension and education, that can serve the rural areas very well.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much.

Unless there is some other specific comment that somebody wants to make, the Chair is about to close this meeting.

But first, we want to tell the panel that Congressman Alphonzo Bell, who was unable to be here this morning, due to other commitments, has some questions he would like to submit to each of you in writing in the hope that you might respond expeditiously to the joint committee in writing for assisting us in our deliberations.

[Information supplied follows:]

Office of the President

700 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312) 787-0977

May 15, 1975

Mr. Jack Duncan
Subcommittee on Select Education
U. S. House of Representatives
2178 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Duncan:

The National PTA appreciates the opportunity to respond to the questions from Representative Alphonzo Bell on the Child and Family Services Act.

Question 1.

In determining the children who should be the focus of this program, a number of points must be considered. First of all, this is a voluntary program, so that no parent need enroll a child if the parent does not desire the services. Also, many parents are able to provide for such services through presently available services, either private or public, and these parents will not require additional assistance. Third, we do not want to see this program aimed only at the poorest segment of the population because there are often needs for a mixed clientele that transcend economic considerations. First consideration, however, should be given to parents who cannot financially provide the necessary services for their children, or to communities where services and facilities are presently unavailable to meet clear needs. The proposed sliding scale costs should keep a good balance in these programs while still offering services to those who need them most.

Question 2.

Quality is not quite as elusive as this question may seem to suggest. In child care, nutritional and medical services, etc., there are accepted professional standards available. Guidance from such recognized authorities as the National Association of Education for Young Children, Association for Childhood Education International, American Pediatric Society, and American Home Economic Society is available, as is the assistance of clearinghouse organizations such as Directions Seminar which deals with

the problems of young children in their broadest scope. Although we do not feel this program should be a duplicate of Head Start, we can and should learn from our past experiences, including those of the Home Start programs. In neither case, however, do we feel that we should be locked into the same structure or procedures for this broader program.

One area that we feel is vital is the emphasis on parent education and parent participation, and we are happy to see the inclusion in the present legislation of methods of reaching families as well as children.

We do feel the specialists noted in Question E are necessary because the bill is designed to meet the full scope of needs for children and their families and PTA is committed to the understanding that proper physical and mental health and an understanding of nutrition have a definite bearing on a youngster's ability to learn.

In regard to Question F, we are aware of studies that indicate that educational enrichment is not necessary, and while we feel this may be true for after-school care, we feel an educational component is extremely important for early childhood programs.

In regard to Question G, our first emphasis would be on funding good programs and adequately trained staff. If renovation or upgrading of existing facilities would be a possible way of stretching use of funds, then such use should be authorized.

On Question H, our emphasis on staff is one of expectation of quality, but qualified professionals do not necessarily mean only classroom teachers. There is a definite move in early childhood staffing to work toward certification based on competency rather than educational requirements. Staff however should always have access to professional resources as noted in our response to Question E, and standards should reflect an emphasis on quality.

Question J has already been dealt with for we feel that parents must be involved in the programs both as recipients of services, as participants in the planning of services, and as employees who extend services, where they meet the standards for staffing. Not only is this helpful for the parents, but it contributes to the success of the program for the children.

Question K. Food services must of course cover the time the child is receiving services, and if this time period coincides with meals or snack periods, then such food should be planned for with emphasis on nutritional quality.

Question L. Day care centers must meet the needs of local communities and each community must determine the hours such services should be available. In many communities, working hours are staggered so that services from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. are required. In any event, adult supervision must be insured during the hours chosen.

Question M. Books are written on the type of program which will achieve a maximum educational experience but briefly we would suggest that the program should stimulate intellectual growth, promote sound nutritional habits, emphasize good physical and mental health, and develop a pattern of self-discipline which will aid a youngster to be successful in future years.

Question 3.

The legislation is not designed to limit the delivery system to the public school patterns and we think this is wise. The patterns for early childhood centers are often so different that school systems neither wish to be, nor are equipped to be, the sole delivery systems. However, we agree with the thrust of the present bill which permits public schools, if they so desire and have the capability, to be prime sponsors. In some communities, this will be the way the community prefers to handle this. We would be opposed to the legislation limiting the delivery system to the public schools. If public schools are <u>not</u> the sponsors, however, we feel it is extremely important for the community and the school system to plan for extensive articulation between the center and the schools such as that which now exists between good private facilities and the public school system. It is important for gains which youngsters make in early childhood centers to serve as the basis for continued progress in the schools, and good communication between them is vital. Problems which are discovered but unresolved (i.e., health matters) must be a part of a continuing effort once the child enters the public school system and such awareness must be built into the plan from the beginning.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

Lillie E. Herndon

Mrs. Lillie E. Herndon
President

LEH:ca

Senator STAFFORD. I would like to announce that the joint committee will meet tomorrow when it recesses from this meeting, the meeting will be in room 2175 in the Rayburn House Office Building, beginning at 9:30.

The focus of the meetings tomorrow will be on the day care and the profitmaking aspects of the day-care program, so I will repeat that the time is 9:30 tomorrow morning and the room is 2175 in the Rayburn Building, which is the newest of the House office buildings.

If there are no further questions before this joint committee, the committee is adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

[Whereupon, at 12:00 noon, the joint subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Friday, March 14, 1975, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building.]